

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXIV, No. 6.

JUNE 1944

THE MEANING OF SACRIFICE

THE purpose of this article is not to urge a controversial point of view in theology, but rather to suggest that the work of theologians philosophizing on the general subject of sacrifice has produced solid results which deserve to be more widely appreciated. These results are not merely "speculative"; they affect our whole attitude to things. Their application to the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary and in the Mass is obviously their supreme importance, but this will not be directly considered here; it would take us too far afield. There is, however, a common objection that general enquiries into the nature of sacrifice have not been of much service to theology, and that it is Calvary and the Mass which should explain the nature of sacrifice rather than the other way about. No one would maintain that a complete account of sacrifice could be given by using only the philosophical data and the sacrifices of the ancient world; everyone would admit that sacrifice finds its full meaning only in our Lord. His sacrifice explains and at the same time abolishes every other. But it presupposes certain permanent facts about our nature and psychology, and it is altogether necessary that these should not be misunderstood. They have been misunderstood in the recent past, and the solid results just mentioned bear on this misunderstanding.

At the beginning of the century sacrifice was commonly defined by Catholic writers as the offering to God of some sensible object by a legitimate priest and its immolation by destruction or otherwise, in order to recognize God's sovereignty over all things and to win pardon for sins. The parts of this definition were thought of as being all of them essential to the whole; thus sacrifice (and so religion itself) was bound up with sin, and some kind of annihilation was supposed to be involved in sacrifice as its material element, for only so could God receive due honour. Here one can hardly avoid mentioning de la Taille, for the part which he played (with whatever inconsistencies) in discrediting this sort of definition was so important. Lepin, in his great work *L'Idée du Sacrifice de la Messe*, drove the lesson home. This has been so widely admitted that it may be permissible to take it for granted among theologians; even those who cannot conceive of sacrifice without destruction of some kind place it in the traditional metaphysical context which de la Taille and Lepin have done so much to restore to us. Yet the change of view has not yet made its full effect upon the general consciousness of the faithful, and to offer a brief statement of it in non-technical terms will perhaps serve some purpose. It may show that we can accept a view of sacrifice which provides us with fundamental principles for all our religious thinking without committing

us to theological disputes. This view is not necessarily bound up with any particular interpretation of the Tridentine teaching on the Mass, and it is perhaps a failure to realize this that has hindered its more widespread diffusion.

It has to be admitted that some theologians, not content with pointing to the inevitable incompleteness of such a theory (prescinding as it does from Christ's sacrifice), seem to regard it as of no particular importance; but among Catholic thinkers who do concern themselves with the subject it holds the field, and if we can show its value we may claim that it ought to be more fully understood, to be part of our minds, to be "lived". It has been urged, for example by Abbot Vonier in his *Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (p. 159), that St. Thomas felt no need to develop a theory of sacrifice. As we shall see, what he does say contains at least the outline of such a theory. But in any case the suggestion that St. Thomas's treatment of the question must be the model for our own seems to overlook the special need which we experience nowadays to clarify the very fundamentals of religion. To a certain extent St. Thomas could take such things for granted as implied by his whole position and as part of the general atmosphere; they required no special emphasis. In our own atmosphere they must struggle for their existence. A true idea of sacrifice is essential for apologetics; it is perhaps also something to be inculcated (if not directly and formally, at least by implication, colouring our instructions) in pastoral work. This is not "preaching philosophy"; it is just recognizing the familiar fact that man, because he has forgotten God, has forgotten man. We were reminded recently that it is hard for a man to "identify himself with Christ's sacrifice" if he knows next to nothing about Christ. It is also hard for him to do so if the very notion of sacrifice has little meaning for him.

The following paragraphs introduce a work, little known in England, which meets this need—*Le Sacrifice du Chef*, by Canon Eugène Masure, which is due to appear in English translation under the title of *The Christian Sacrifice*¹ before these lines are read. The opening section on the idea of sacrifice sums up much recent work in a peculiarly attractive way, so it seems to me, simplifying it and deepening it at the same time. We have seen that the definition of sacrifice so popular not long ago placed in the forefront immolation, considered primarily as destruction, and the remission of sin. "As if," writes Masure, "religion were not previous to sin in history and in metaphysics. . . . To justify the disconcerting fact (of immolation), without excessive efforts of spiritual and religious reflection, the doctrine of God as sovereign of life and death, true enough in principle, is suddenly introduced . . . we destroy victims and oblations for His glory. There are large elements of truth in this summary account, but the perspective is narrow and lacks depth. This hasty and indirect way of approaching so considerable a problem rules out from the start any wider

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne.

metaphysic of the subject. It is a way of approaching it, but a close and stifling one. . . ." It involves a pessimism and a superficial view (to give it no worse name) of our duties towards God; and it easily implies a false view of God's own nature. Sacrifice, properly understood, is something positive, which springs from our deepest needs, from the very root of human personality.

The principle which lies behind all sacrifice is found in St. Augustine's famous sentences: "Visible sacrifice is the sacrament of the invisible sacrifice (of our inward religious life), that is, its sacred sign. . . . Any work performed that we may cleave to God in holy union is a true sacrifice."¹ Sacrifice, in the accepted sense, is always visible; but it is always a sign of the invisible. The word "sign" will receive fuller meaning as we proceed. Meanwhile it will be worth while to collect the important texts from St. Thomas. In the *Summa Theologica* he considers sacrifice as it is today in the Redemptive economy, and quotes the second passage from St. Augustine in this context.² But he has adopted it earlier³ as a general formula. Quoting the first passage he adds "therefore everything that is presented (*exhibetur*) to God that the spirit of man may be lifted up to Him may be called a sacrifice",⁴ and this does seem to show his mind quite clearly, although when he goes on to detail three reasons for sacrifice (turning to our present condition) he places the remission of sins and the preservation of grace before union with God. This same Augustinian definition is paraphrased in the *Summa contra Gentiles*⁵ where St. Thomas adds that the soul (*mens*) offers itself to God in sacrifice "as to the principle of its creation, the author of its operation and the end of its beatification" (repeated in substance in the greater *Summa*, II, II, q. 85, a. 2). To clinch the matter we have the following passage on the Old Law: "Sacrifices put before men's eyes the right ordering of the mind to God . . . man must recognize that all things that he has come to him from God . . . and he must refer them to Him as their last end."⁶

It is in the light of these passages that we must interpret the following: "There is sacrifice properly so called when the things which are offered to God are the subject of an action, as when animals were killed and burnt and when bread is broken and eaten and blessed. This is the meaning of the word itself; sacrifice means *making sacred* . . . oblation is a common name for everything presented to God's service . . . if anything is (so) presented to be transformed into something sacred . . . then we have both oblation and sacrifice."⁷ "Transformed" represents *consumentum*, which sounds like special pleading only if we forget the context; Lepin seems to have made out his case for this translation (he sees a reference here to the bread of the Eucharist). Sacrifice, for St. Thomas, is primarily a transformation.

¹ *De Civ. Dei*, Bk. X, chs. 5 and 6.

² III, q. 48, a. 3.

³ II, q. 85, a. 3, ad. 1.

⁴ III, q. 22, a. 2.

⁵ Bk. III, ch. 120.

⁶ I, II, q. 102, a. 3.

⁷ II, II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3; q. 86 c.

Masure makes a somewhat incomplete and indiscriminate use of St. Thomas's words, but the conclusion he draws from them is an established one: a sacrifice is an object made sacred; to sacrifice is to provide oneself with such a sacred object, *se procurer du divin*. The writer of the article, "Sacrifice", in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (1939), who uses Masure, concludes as follows: "the theory of sacrifice-destruction is (relatively) recent and without sufficient foundation; that of sacrifice-oblation, on the other hand, is guaranteed by the witness of the Fathers and theologians" (col. 678). The same writer quotes also (col. 675) a passage from a recent book by M. Lepin¹ which may conveniently sum up our general results so far: "Man's adoration will not lead him any more than his sin to annihilate the being which he has received, as if this were the best means of honouring the divine Being. His most deep-seated tendency will rather be to bear witness that he receives this being from his Creator, and to offer it in a movement of desire and intention and effective determination to Him who is its last end, as He is its first beginning. This is the only way, glorious to God, of recognizing His sovereign sway. Man's sacrifice will not be an act of destruction separating the creature violently from his Creator, but an act of *offering* or *donation* which opens the way to intimate communion with Him."

The value of Masure's account lies in his filling out of this general picture and, in particular, in his insistence on the function of sacrifice as a *sign*, thus setting the idea of immolation in its true light, and breaking down its apparent opposition to oblation.

First, then, the function of signs. The outward sign of our inward religion, the liturgical rite, is not just a piece of pious make-believe. It belongs to the very essence of the rational animal that he should express himself in sensible forms. Not only does his religion demand to be "translated" externally by a psychological necessity, but also it is itself engendered by this expression. Psychologists are well aware that we form mental habits and make them part of ourselves by outward actions which correspond with them. The whole sacramental system is based on the fundamental need of our human nature to approach the spiritual through the material. We are familiar with the idea of the spiritual coming down to us in a material envelope. We are less familiar with the idea of making the material the vehicle by which our worship and love of God, all our hopes and fears, may rise to Him. Yet it is the peculiar business of man, corresponding with his peculiar position in the scheme of things, to saturate matter with spirit—to give it *significance*. And it is by becoming thus incarnate, following the law of our nature, that our desire of God becomes effective. Such is our way to God, and, apart from this, sacrifice is meaningless.

But sacrifice aims at something more than a mere stimulus on the way to God. It aims at union with Him. We make *something* sacred, and we

¹ *La Messe et Nous*, 1937.

believe that God accepts it. Once accepted by Him, it is the means by which His blessings come down to us, the channel of our communion with Him, the pledge of our heavenly alliance and the foretaste of our future blessedness. The sign of our religion becomes the sign of His grace. When we look back at the strange medley of rites in ancient sacrifice, so unintelligible at first and sometimes so revolting, we can discern the same rhythm in all of them, "the hidden line of movement towards God". What, then, more precisely, is the inner logic of this undertaking? We are on the way to God, and we must express (and so expand) our longing to behold Him; at the same time we hope to gain some earnest of our distant prize. We would show in some way our desire to throw ourselves upon Him, our willingness to count the world well lost to gain Him; so we make over effectively to His service some gift which He has made us, some visible object of His creation. We give it its true significance. If it is in our power and belongs to us, that is only because both we and it belong to God. It is a stepping-stone to God, and we express by a deliberate ritual act our recognition of it. We offer ourselves with it that God may ratify it by His acceptance and return it to us; it goes on embassy from us, and it comes back laden with heavenly wealth. But that involves a provisional renunciation. We must set it aside, deprive ourselves of the use of it for any lesser end. This is immolation.

The coming of sin gives it a fresh emphasis. "Offering our life to God in Eden would have been a prayer, a thing supremely sweet; today this encounter is called the world over by the name of death." Let us consider how sin came. God asked our first parents for a sign. A certain tree was to be set aside; they were to forgo the use of it at God's command. The metaphysic of sacrifice, its essential law, was set before them, and they disobeyed it. Henceforth sin sweeps us from our course, the course which God had planned for us, upward and not free from danger, but unbroken. And now a further and a previous means of union is required—breaking with sin. Not only must we recognize that this world's goods are God's, and that we must not rest in them; we must recognize too that we are chained to them and we must break our chains. That is why the "giving up" in sacrifice, the immolation, becomes destruction. Sacrifice must symbolize now a bitter necessity, an uprooting, a doing violence to ourselves.

Religion, in the eyes of so many around us, is just a means of emotional satisfaction; they regret its association with what they think of as systems, varying in complexity, of taboos and legends. We warn the faithful against the insidious influences of this sort of talk; we try to impress on them that God's service is really perfect freedom, that it is not an affair of negations and restrictions, but the conquest of reality, the attainment of the supreme and infinite Good. We may succeed in making them

understand that human living must be a self-dedication if it is to achieve its purpose; that our Lord's words about finding our souls by losing them provide the only programme which works. . . . But even so sacrifice may not seem to fit in without something added. To make it the subject of a special discourse may not be feasible, and may be quite unnecessary; if we have the right attitude to it ourselves, no doubt we shall communicate it in one way or another. But a few suggestions (offered with all the diffidence of inexperience) may be acceptable by way of appendix to this article. We can encourage people to see that "giving things to God" is not just a "pious practice" (and one which seems to have little sense in it, the more hard-headed may be inclined to say). We can show them that it is simply a law of nature that we should perform outward acts of religion, and that these outward acts should *give body* to our intentions.

We may need to start sometimes by saying quite frankly that in the literal sense we can "give" God nothing. In fact what we do is to forgo things—but this not only because they might prove obstacles to us, because we fear some inordinate attachment, but also because we intend to *use* them positively as a means of closer union with our Lord. This law was once perfectly exemplified at the offertory, when the faithful themselves presented the bread and wine; no doubt we remind our people of that when we urge them to "offer themselves" with Christ in the Mass (and there seems no need to shrink from referring to the "collection" in such a context). But it might be a help to show them that it *is* a law, and that it must work throughout all our lives. For the *positive* sense of sacrifice is too seldom realized; it is thought of in terms of "mortification" and "discipline", and these form only one side of the total meaning. Sacrifice is not only to keep us from falling, but also to help us advance in the right direction.

To "sacrifice" means to use things for God, for their proper purpose. And this means in practice "doing without things". But the things which we "do without" are not thrown to waste—they are put to God's service. In giving alms, for instance, this is quite obvious. But it is no less true in what we call our "ascetical" practices, when we push the novel aside or cut down tobacco. The untouched jar is not only a proof of will-power; it should represent for us so many acts of increased devotion—in that sense we use it for God and we find God in it. We must "*use*" *something*, because that happens to correspond with our nature.

The most fruitful deprivations (spiritual writers assure us) are those which are imposed on us by circumstances. It may be misleading to say that God "sends" them; but it is certainly true that He gives us the power to use them. And we need not suspect, as we usually must with our own arrangements, that our motives may be more or less mixed. The sacrifices which are imposed on us are harder than those which we impose on ourselves in so far as they upset our plans—and this may be (inevitably) most unpleasant. It is the opportunity to realize that all our plans are (or ought

to be) stages on the way to God. If one set breaks down, God can make another do just as well, if not better (often in what may seem to us a round-about way). We must treat the stages of the journey as what they are, not as the goal. This is the one great difficulty; but it is just life. It is the old truth that we have to forsake the shadows to find the substance. We can free the ideas of immolation and sacrifice from confusion by showing that they are contained (in principle) in these platitudes.

We might point out, then, that sacrifice is not an "extra"—something which specially holy people feel called on to do in special circumstances. In this root sense of it, it is what has made them holy. But, further, it is what makes everyone holy. The popular idea of sacrifice fixes on something accidental to it, on the cost which nowadays (since sin) it demands of us. But it does point also to something in it of extreme importance. Sacrifice does imply generosity. The journey to God is a matter of obligation; but we have choice of routes and (still more) of speeds. Here is room for love's freedom and spontaneity, for the working of the Holy Spirit which we must not quench, for the unpredictable uprisings of spiritual forces in the Church's history. Charity is found within a framework of laws, but cannot be reduced to any discoverable set of them. We do not quench the Spirit by showing that sacrifice is the law of our nature. The point precisely is that we may prepare for it, making it seem something less remote from our own unspectacular existences. The measure of our Christian humanism is our love of sacrifice. And to understand this should be a spur to charity.

Finally the doctrine of sacrifice as a sign may lead us to give a fresh emphasis to the exact performance of the liturgical rites, the immensely rich system of significant gestures which surrounds the Christian Sacrifice. From the purely human point of view an educationist might well envy our opportunities for the cultural formation of our Catholic children. (The breakdown of the "sign" in the barbarizing of our Western civilization might make an interesting and painful study.) To teach a child to make a *real* sign of the Cross or to genuflect as an act of deliberate worship is to engage specifically human functions in their highest exercise; this is true art. We do not want to regiment congregations. They must not feel obliged (as a writer in this REVIEW said recently) to keep their noses buried in missals; but one of the reasons is that they ought to see what is happening, to follow the priest's significant movements (up to a point, at least) and to *use* their meanings. Following the liturgical text is often difficult; but everyone, if warned in advance, can keep an *eye* open for this or that and take something to heart.

DOM ILLTYD TRETHOWAN.

THE BASIS OF CO-OPERATION

I.—THE CATHOLIC WRITER'S DILEMMA

IT is not the purpose of these pages to deal with all the complex difficulties which beset social co-operation with non-Catholics; they are concerned with the important preliminary work which a Catholic writer might undertake, of preparing the minds of non-Catholics (and incidentally of Catholics, too) for those personal contacts, discussions and common action which make up the stuff of the co-operation. Such writing involves an understanding of the mentality of members of the Church of England and of the Free Churches in all their variety, and the question arises in what way he is to speak of the bearing of *religion* on the social and international problems which are the direct object in view. He is a Catholic, he knows his Faith, he believes in the divine authority of the Church, and he is faced with the dilemma: *either* he proclaims his Faith in its fulness, insisting on those dogmas which are denied by many if not by all those outside the Church—in which case he antagonizes his readers and so defeats his own ends; *or* he will water down the expression of his Faith, choosing only such truths as are in some way agreeable to the majority of his prospective readers—in which case he seems to be encouraging ambiguities and to be wanting in loyalty to the Church and to the Faith.

With regard to the first horn of the dilemma, if the direct object of his writing were to make converts of his readers, he would explain the Faith as clearly as possible, and develop the reasons for his Faith in the hope of convincing them of its truth and so leading them into the one ark of salvation for all. But though he need not exclude such hopes from his mind, this is not his direct purpose now. His direct purpose is to persuade his non-Catholic readers to join their Catholic brethren in resisting the evil things that are abroad, and therefore the reasons he must give are such as already appeal to them or can be made to appeal to them now, not reasons which only prove that they are wrong, and which are, therefore, from the outset unpalatable.

The second horn of the dilemma remains. Obviously, a writer might allow his zeal to run away with him and so make statements incompatible with his Faith. But he is encouraged to think that he can both avoid antagonizing his readers and also be completely loyal to the Faith, by the appeal which the Popes have been making to all men of goodwill—"even though separated from Us"—to unite in the defence of fundamental divine and human values. For how can they unite unless they enter into friendly communication? The Popes do not presuppose conversion; therefore Catholics—if on them primarily lies the duty of listening to their appeal—need not present all the implications of their Faith from A to Z, and so *ab initio* antagonize the other men of goodwill.

Some would admit the justice of this, but they would restrict its application. They will argue: No doubt it would be folly to insist that the whole Catholic position should be admitted by non-Catholics before further contacts, or co-operation, were attempted. But let the Catholic writer confine himself

to the Natural Law, of which he can speak freely without exposing his Faith to misunderstanding. The moment he leaves this field he will inevitably suggest that he and his readers share "common beliefs", perhaps even "common sacraments". He will suggest to his readers that, after all, "there exists a higher 'organic' unity above the unity of the Church, in which all separated elements in Christendom may be absorbed when they accept the Kingship of Christ . . . as a 'social reality'".¹ In other words, consideration for the religious mentality of non-Catholic Christians seems necessarily to involve prejudice to the Faith, and to imply in the writer himself a denial of the unique unity of the Church, a denial of her divine authority, a denial perhaps of any clear distinction between the natural and the supernatural. At the very least, the question can be asked: "Would a non-Catholic reader get a true understanding of the Catholic teaching from contact with such expressions?"²

Before considering these difficulties, and without prejudice to what their discussion may bring, this much may be allowed in favour of going beyond the Natural Law and appealing to *Christian* ideals and practices.³ Our aim may be no more than co-operation "in the social and international field"; but to leave out of account those religious motives, those springs of action which are at the core of men's lives, is to sacrifice what is most potent in determining human action in the concrete; it is to rely on the efficacy of abstract principle alone instead of on the living realities as they are given in human flesh and mind and blood; it is ultimately to depart from the divine wisdom of the Incarnation. We must take men as they are, as God permits them to be, and, provided the exigencies of the Faith do not exclude such an appeal, we must appeal to them by all they hold most dear to join us in saving mankind from the horrors of a Godless inhuman culture.

II.—"COMMON BELIEFS, ETC."

It is clear enough that there must be no sacrifice of the Faith in the way such an appeal is made. Co-operation presupposes some real, if as yet limited, *understanding* (taken in the literal sense) between the different parties. To sacrifice the Faith in the process of creating such an "understanding" would be self-contradictory. The question, then, is whether some of the expressions that have been criticized really involve any such sacrifice.

We need not here discuss those points which are based on the abstention from expressing the *whole* Faith. In general, it may be said that a certain "economy" is justified under certain circumstances.⁴ Otherwise we should not be allowed to help a dying Methodist to make an act of perfect contrition for the reason that we could not first show him that it logically involved the

¹ I avail myself of Dr. A. Beck's criticisms of Mr. C. Dawson's *Judgment of the Nations*, because they express the problem in its crucial form. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, March, 1944, pp. 97-108.

² *Ibid.* p. 104.

³ The writer may be allowed to refer to an article in the *Month*, July-Aug., 1942, pp. 298-306, *Christian Co-operation in England Today*, for a general treatment of this question.

⁴ No doubt non-Catholic readers will not get a *full* understanding of the Catholic teaching from contact with such expressions. But this is not the purpose of such writing. What is true as far as it goes need not give a *false* understanding of *some part* of Catholic teaching.

acknowledgement of Papal Infallibility! After all, St. Paul felt he needed to temper his teaching at times, and in this he was only following Our Lord's example when He refrained from telling His Apostles many things because "they could not bear them now", and who certainly used "economy" in the predictions of His second coming.

To come, then, to something which might, at first, look like a serious debasement of the Faith. One of the marks of the Church is her unity. We emphasize that as Catholics we have "common beliefs, common Sacraments, common forms of worship". We mean by this that the truths of the Faith are all held by Catholics the world over, that we all have the seven Sacraments, that we all have the Mass, etc. We may, therefore, feel a shock when we read, for instance, of "the importance of the common beliefs, the common moral values, the common religious traditions and the common sacraments and forms of worship that exist *in the midst of the divisions of the Christian world*". This may appear to us to be either nonsense—for everyone knows that none of those outside the Church holds *all* that we hold in these matters—or else heresy, as implying that our beliefs, sacraments, etc., are to be reduced in number to the level of the Highest Common Factor of all the denominations.¹ But actually there is a third sense, perfectly legitimate even in Catholic parlance, and the one most likely to occur to the non-Catholic reader of a book that is combating neo-paganism. *As compared with pagans and neo-pagans*, who have none of these things, Christians—differing as they do in so many ways—have many points in common, which constitute a reason for their banding together against the common threat to them all. Thus in the religious sphere (which alone is in question here), as between the Orthodox and ourselves, the things wherein we differ, important as they are, do not affect the number and importance of those which we have in common. Sacraments, Mass, true Bishops and priests, Scripture, Tradition: nearly all that we hold to be essential, they do so too. And each of the other Christian bodies has, in varying degrees, a certain number of beliefs, traditions, practices, etc., in common with us. Not that any share *all* that we have; not that all share the same things with us, but all share some of them, and we can point at once to Baptism, the unique authority of Christ (very often His mediatorship and even His full divinity, too), and to the "Our Father", as some of the things which are almost universally held by them. If, then, we boggled at the phrase quoted, it was only because we were thinking in a Catholic setting. We have only to look at it against the neo-pagan background about us to see what is meant by it.

This is no side-issue, and it is important for us to accustom ourselves to thinking in this way. Non-Catholics often think we *deny* some of the great truths of the Faith (which they see are essential and themselves hold) because we do not mention them in what we write for their benefit. We have been so busy—and rightly—in maintaining what *distinguishes* our Faith from theirs, that we have left the impression that we *repudiate* what, in fact, we have not needed to defend. We did not need to do so because it was common ground, common belief. It was natural not to emphasize it in the early days of Protestantism; but we need to remember it now, not only for its eirenic value, but also for its own intrinsic value both for us and for them.

¹ Often mistakenly referred to in "Reunion" writings as the L.C.M.!

III.—THE THEOLOGICAL VIRTUE OF FAITH

But are we not, perhaps, going too fast? Is not this a very superficial view? No doubt those who revolted against the Church in the past kept certain of her forms and practices, and these survive today among their descendants. But has the reality behind these forms remained? When they speak of "faith", have they really got Faith in their souls, since their reasons for believing seem so inadequate, so subjective? If they have only the vaguest ideas about the distinction between the natural and the supernatural, is their "Faith" really a supernatural thing, the supernatural, infused virtue? Even if they are most estimable people, kindly and self-sacrificing, may not these qualities remain only on the natural plane? If so, then however much they seem to have "in common" with us, it is merely diplomacy, opportunism, to suggest to them in our writings that they share with us those deep spiritual realities which God bestows on us through the Church. If they are not, in fact, raised to the supernatural order, we cannot in conscience appeal to their "faith, hope, and charity", as if these were the theological virtues which we normally understand by these words. It would, indeed, be suggesting a non-existent identity under the cover of ambiguous terms—and the charity which prompted such a course would be as misguided as it was misleading.

Before attempting to deal with this attitude we must pause and ask ourselves what are its implications. Taken strictly as it stands, it means that no one but a Catholic can have, infused in his soul, those theological virtues which are necessary for salvation. It means that, no matter what his circumstances, upbringing, opportunities, anyone who is not a Catholic in the full sense before he dies will be eternally lost. Yet the Vatican Council was at pains to remove from its decrees any phrase which might in any way imply this.¹ Our text-books, dogmatic and moral, distinguish between the revealed truths which are necessary *necessitate medii*, and those which are necessary *necessitate praecepti*. The point is too obvious to need elaborating; but it excludes the notion that because a man does not hold the Catholic Faith, he cannot therefore have *Faith*—the theological supernatural infused virtue without which none can be saved. But if we all recognize this, we may not have faced up to it in such a way as to realize its implications. We are taught that Faith (like peace) is indivisible, that the denial of a single article of Faith means the loss of Faith altogether: the result is that we admit the possibility of a *reduced* Faith only with our lips, and fail to recognize it when we meet it in the flesh.

The fact is that, surrounding the questions of "Faith" and "good faith" is a veil of mystery which cannot be penetrated or swept aside by any slapdash distinction. We can only approach and try to sense humbly what lies behind. And what we find seems to be this: Faith is not a matter merely of holding such and such truths revealed by God because we know He has revealed them. It *is* that, but what is primary is not that we should get the

¹ Cf. *Constitutio Dei Filius*, cap. iii, emendation 54. Bishop Martin of Paderborn, speaking for the *Deputatio de fide*, told the Council that this emendation was accepted "ne videretur omnibus ad salutem necessarium esse actum fidei catholicae; nam hoc falsum esset".

truths right, but that we should have in our souls a certain attitude to God, a grace-prompted attitude in response to His proffered gift. The essential alchemy of Faith takes place in the innermost recesses of a man's conscience: will, mind, self are all involved as God's grace touches him. Nor is what we believe a static whole—and our acceptance of it is not done once and for all. The content of even one mystery is inexhaustible: shall we be satisfied with what we understood of it the first time we heard it? Can we afford to be so satisfied? Have we not to *grow* in the Faith, as St. Paul says? Shall we ever exhaust it? And if some difficulty presents itself to us about our Faith, shall we be the same after as before it showed itself? Shall we not be either the weaker in our Faith for having toyed with the difficulty, or the stronger for having reasserted our Faith in accordance with the Church's teaching? Or may it not even be our duty, according to our capacity, to see in the difficulty a call to probe deeper into the mystery involved, to try to see what, in view of a perhaps quite plausible objection, there is in the mystery beyond what we had so far seen? If we do, shall we not thus "grow" in the Faith, and if we do not, may we not be endangering our "good faith"? Again, we are urged by the Church often to make acts of Faith. Is not one reason for this precisely that our minds, that we ourselves, are growing, developing all the time, and that our Faith must keep pace?

If, then, our own experience, in accordance with the Scriptures, shows that we may have now a narrower, now a larger comprehension of the mysteries of the Faith, if likewise Catholic may differ from Catholic in the actual scope of the Faith which he lives by, so there is no reason for denying that true Faith may exist in those who do not recognize the Church's authority, and that it may, for this very reason, vary very much in its content according to circumstances and according to the graces offered to and accepted by each of them. What is more, and more to our present purpose, we may be unable to assign any reasonable ground for their holding this or that revealed truth; in fact, they may not be able to do so themselves. Yet this need not exclude their holding those truths by a real act of Faith. We ourselves would be hard put to it to give a full and articulated description of what our personal grasp of the Faith contains and supposes, for it would have to include the deepest recesses of psychological introspection and that still deeper region of the supernatural where grace is working beyond the field of consciousness. Who, then, shall judge what has been going on in another's soul? The words he speaks may even mislead us. Thus a professed atheist may, unknown even to himself, really believe in God: his atheism may only be the denial of some *erroneous* view of God which is all that his upbringing has given him, while the ideals which he professes may be the all too inadequate expression of a deep recognition of the God who has been misrepresented to him.¹

¹ "The Christian knows that God has infinite resources; and that the possibilities of good faith stretch farther than men imagine. Under many names, names which are not that of God, in ways only known to God, the interior act of a soul's thought can be directed towards a reality which, in fact, truly may be God. To every soul, even to one ignorant of the name of God, even one reared in atheism, grace offers . . . as something to be loved above all things . . . that Reality of absolute goodness, which merits all our love and is able to save our life." Maritain, *True Humanism*, pp. 56-7. Cf. P. Claeys-Bouuaert: "Tous les athées sont-ils coupables?" in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (1921), pp.

But if once this is possible, even in the case of the professed atheist, we cannot refuse something analogous to the Christian, however erroneous the language which he uses may seem to be, however inadequate in our eyes the way in which he "explains the Faith that is in him". He may vehemently oppose the claims of the Church; he may doubt, or even deny, the vital distinction between natural and supernatural: that will not necessarily mean that the life of grace, the life of the supernatural virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity, is not active in his soul.¹ It is no doubt incomplete and partly choked by the presence of the tares of erroneous ideas, but that only suggests that here is a field for the delicacy of Christian charity, which will not deny outright the presence of the true life because it cannot see it, nor recklessly try to root out the tares which it sees, lest in so doing what life was there be destroyed too.

"Without Faith it is impossible to please God"—"God wills all men to be saved"—"Christ died for all men". And since "man seeth those things that appear; but the Lord beholdeth the heart", it is not for us to judge of any man that God is not at work in his soul, and that there is no response of Faith and Charity there, however grotesque may be the external appearances. Pius IX cannot be accused of having minimized the necessity of belonging to the visible body of the Church; yet almost in the same breath that he proclaimed it, he warned his hearers against lack of charity and untimely condemnation. "God forbid, Venerable Brethren, that we should dare to set limits to His infinite mercy; God forbid that we should attempt to penetrate the hidden counsels and judgments of God, which are as a deep abyss and are beyond human thought to plumb. . . . (The Church is, indeed, the one ark of salvation.) Yet it is no less true that those who, in all sincerity, remain ignorant of the true religion are not accounted guilty for this in the sight of God. Now who is so overweening as to think that he can determine the limits of the sincerity of such ignorance, when he takes account of the varying characters of different nations, countries, mental capacities and a thousand other considerations?" (*Denzinger*, 1646-48; cf. 1677-78).

Therefore, to sum up the results of these reflections, there seems to be no theological objection to an appeal that all "informed and convinced Christians all over the country" should co-operate in the restoration of a Christian social and international order, not only on the basis of the Natural Law, but on the basis of "common beliefs, etc." and by the exercise of the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. The fact that these virtues, in the strict supernatural sense, may not be understood by all in exactly the same sense, and may not even be present in many of those we appeal to, is no reason for condemning such an appeal: God alone reads the heart; and though prudence and other considerations may have to qualify the manner and the character of such an appeal, it is not *a limine* excluded by the exigencies of the Faith. The Faith does not require us to believe that our non-Catholic brethren are deprived of true Faith; that which they are certainly

169 ff., especially 179-83, where Cajetan and the Salmanticenses are quoted. These references and much else in the present article are taken from the illuminating study by Jean Mouroux: "Structure 'personnelle' de la Foi" in *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (1939), pp. 59-107.

¹ In which case he will also have "*implicitly*" the desire to enter the fold of the Church—however paradoxical this may sound.

deprived one of these is one object of the Faith which is, besides, the master-key to God's Revelation as a whole: the divine authority of the Catholic Church. Nor does the Faith require us to believe that they are deprived of hope and charity, even though they cannot draw on those special means of grace which the true Church alone administers: once given true Faith, however incomplete, their hope and charity may be such as to put some of us to shame.

If, then, we can appeal to all these motives when writing for our non-Catholic brethren, we can, it would seem, appeal also to the greatest of them all: the ideal of unity under the Kingship of Christ. This ideal is very strong among them, and if it can be shown that this ideal will only be realized if political and cultural rivalries are first resolved by goodwill and co-operation, then a new impulse will be given to practical thought and action. On the supposition that that hypothesis is true, to maintain that solutions in the field of culture will, in fact, tend to relieve tension between the divided bodies of Christendom, is not to treat religious unity as a means subordinated to the end of social and world peace, but, on the contrary, to exalt it as an end to be attained which transcends all other and merely earthly aims. The form which religious unity will eventually take need not be defined in such a context; what already unites all Christians can be fitly summed up as the common recognition of the universal Kingship of Christ; to say more at this stage would be to re-arouse those feelings which are of cultural rather than religious growth, and which co-operation is calculated to appease.

MAURICE BÉVENOT, S.J.

THE HOMILIES OF THE BREVIARY AS COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS

WHEN reciting the Office one is often struck by an explanation of a Scriptural text in one of the Homilies, but later when dealing with that text in a sermon one cannot discover the Homily required. This index may help to find it and is accordingly arranged in the order of the Gospels and not in the order of the Breviary. It is confined to Homilies dealing with particular texts and does not include passages like those from the works of St. John Chrysostom within the Octave of the Dedication of a Church, where he deals with the ninth chapter of St. Matthew in general. Since such Homilies, except in the case of a few Offices, occur in the 3rd Nocturn, no further reference than to the Feast or day has been given. Where a Homily is repeated more than once in the Breviary, only one reference to it has been considered necessary.

Several interesting facts emerge. As might be expected, Augustine has by far the greatest number of appearances, more than eighty. Gregory the Great has nearly sixty and Ambrose between thirty and forty. Jerome

is next with nearly thirty and our own English Doctor, the Venerable Bede, is well represented with seventeen. Most of the other Doctors and Fathers appear with varying frequency, but a most striking absence from the 3rd Nocturn is that of St. Thomas Aquinas. It is noticeable, too, that there is a great preponderance in favour of Doctors of the Western Church, though St. John Chrysostom does much to redress the balance.

I. THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
i, 1-16	St. Joachim, 16th Aug. ..	Damascene
"	Nativity of B.V.M., 8th Sept. ..	Augustine
i, 18-21	St. Joseph, 19th March ..	Jerome
ii, 1-12	Epiphany	Gregory the Great
"	" Octave, 2nd Day ..	"
"	" " 3rd Day ..	"
"	" " 4th Day ..	"
"	" " 5th Day ..	Jerome
"	" " 6th Day ..	Ambrose
ii, 13-18	Holy Innocents, 28th Dec. ..	Jerome
ii, 19-23	Vigil of Epiphany ..	"
iv, 1-11	1st Sunday in Lent ..	Gregory the Great
iv, 18-20	St. Andrew, 30th Nov. ..	"
v, 1-12	All Saints, 1st Nov. ..	Augustine
"	" Octave, 3rd Day ..	"
"	" " 5th Day ..	"
"	" " 6th Day ..	"
"	" " 7th Day ..	"
"	" Octave Day ..	"
"	St. Boniface, 5th June ..	"
v, 13-19	Common of Doctor ..	"
i, 1-16	St. Joachim, 16th Aug. ..	Damascene
"	Nativity of Our Lady, 8th Sept. ..	Augustine
i, 18-21	St. Joseph, 19th March ..	Jerome
ii, 1-12	Epiphany	Gregory the Great
"	" Octave, 2nd Day ..	"
"	" " 3rd Day ..	"
"	" " 4th Day ..	"
"	" " 5th Day ..	Jerome
"	" " 6th Day ..	Ambrose
ii, 13-18	Holy Innocents, 28th Dec. ..	Jerome
ii, 19-23	Vigil of Epiphany ..	"
iv, 1-11	1st Sunday in Lent ..	Gregory the Great
iv, 18-20	St. Andrew, 30th Nov. ..	"

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
v 1-12	All Saints' 1st Nov. ..	Augustine
"	" Octave 3rd Day ..	"
"	" " 5th Day ..	"
"	" " 6th Day ..	"
"	" " 7th Day ..	"
"	" Octave Day ..	"
"	St. Boniface, 5th June ..	"
v, 13-19	Common of Doctor ..	"
v, 13-19	Common of Doctor, II ..	Hilary
"	Common of Doctor, III ..	Chrysostom
"	Gregory the Great, 12th March ..	Gregory the Great
"	St. Isidore, 4th April ..	Isidore
"	St. Peter Canisius, 27th April ..	Canisius
"	Venerable Bede, 27th May ..	Bede
"	St. Robert Bellarmine, 13th May ..	Bellarmino
"	St. Jerome, 30th Sept. ..	Jerome
v, 20-24	5th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Augustine
v, 43-48	St. John Gualbert, 12th July ..	Jerome
vi, 1-4	Friday after Ash Wednesday ..	"
vi, 16-24	Ash Wednesday ..	Augustine
vi, 24-33	14th Sunday after Pentecost ..	"
vi, 24-33	St. Cajetan, 7th Aug. ..	"
vii, 15-21	7th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Hilary
viii, 1-13	3rd Sunday after Epiphany ..	Jerome
viii, 5-13	Thursday after Ash Wednesday ..	Augustine
viii, 23-27	4th Sunday after Epiphany ..	Jerome
ix, 1-8	18th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Chrysologus
ix, 9-13	St. Matthew, 21st Sept. ..	Jerome
ix, 18-26	23rd Sunday after Pentecost ..	"
x, 16-22	St. Barnabas, 11th June ..	Chrysostom
x, 16-22	St. Paul, 30th June ..	"
x, 23-28	St. Athanasius, 2nd May ..	Athanasius
x, 26-32	Common of One Martyr, IV ..	Hilary
x, 34-42	Common of One Martyr, III ..	"
xi, 2-10	2nd Sunday of Advent ..	Gregory the Great
xi, 25-30	Common of Abbot, II ..	Augustine
xi, 25-30	St. Margaret Mary Alacoque, 17th Oct. ..	Francis de Sales
xii, 38-50	Ember Wednesday in Lent ..	Ambrose
xii, 46-50	Seven Brothers, 10th July ..	Gregory the Great
xiii, 24-30	5th Sunday after Epiphany ..	Augustine
xiii, 31-45	6th Sunday after Epiphany ..	Jerome
xiii, 44-52	Common of Non-Virgins ..	Gregory the Great

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
xiv, 22-23	Octave of SS. Peter and Paul, 6th July	Jerome
xv, 1-20	Wednesday in 3rd Week of Lent ..	"
xv, 21-28	Thursday in 1st Week of Lent ..	"
xvi, 13-19	Chair of St. Peter at Rome, 18th Jan.	Hilary
"	Chair of St. Peter at Antioch, 22nd Feb.	Leo the Great
"	St. Leo I, 11th April	"
"	SS. Peter and Paul, 29th June ..	Jerome
"	St. Peter in Chains, 1st Aug. ..	Augustine
xvi, 24-27	Common of One Martyr, II ..	Gregory the Great
xvii, 1-19	2nd Sunday in Lent	Leo the Great
"	Ember Saturday in Lent	"
"	Transfiguration, 6th Aug. ..	Chrysostom
xviii, 1-4	St. Theresa of the Child Jesus, 30th Oct.	Leo the Great
xviii, 1-5	St. John Baptist de la Salle, 15th May	Chrysostom
xviii, 1-10	Dedication of St. Michael, 29th Sept.	Jerome
"	Guardian Angels, 2nd Oct. ..	Hilary
xviii, 15-22	Tuesday of 3rd Week in Lent ..	Augustine
xviii, 23-35	21st Sunday after Pentecost ..	Jerome
xix, 3-12	Common of Virgins, III ..	Chrysostom
xix, 13-21	St. Jerome, 20th July	"
xix, 27-29	Common of Apostles	Jerome
"	Common of Apostles, II	Bede
"	Common of Abbot	Jerome
"	" III	Bede
xx, 1-6	Septuagesima Sunday	Gregory the Great
xx, 17-28	Wednesday in 2nd Week of Lent	Ambrose
xx, 20-23	St. John before the Latin Gate, 6th May	Jerome
"	St. Theresa, 25th July	Chrysostom
xxi, 1-9	Palm Sunday	Ambrose
xxi, 10-17	Tuesday in 1st Week of Lent ..	Bede
xxi, 15-21	22nd Sunday after Pentecost ..	Hilary
xxi, 33-46	Friday in 3rd Week of Lent ..	Ambrose
xxii, 1-14	19th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Hilary
"	St. Joseph of Cupertino, 18th Sept.	Gregory the Great
xxii, 29-40	St. Aloysius, 21st June	Chrysostom
xxii, 34-46	17th Sunday after Pentecost ..	"
xxiii, 1-12	Tuesday of 2nd Week of Lent ..	Jerome

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
xxiii, 34-39	St. Stephen, 26th Dec. . . .	Jerome
xxiv, 3-13	St. Januarius and Others, 19th Sept.	Hilary
xxiv, 15-35	24th Sunday after Pentecost . .	Jerome
xxiv, 42-47	Common of Confessor Pontiff, II	Hilary
xxv, 1-13	Common of Virgins	Gregory the Great
xxv, 1-13	St. Cecily, 22nd Nov. . . .	Chrysostom
xxv, 14-23	Common of Confessor Pontiff . .	Gregory the Great
xxv, 31-46	Monday in 1st Week of Lent . .	Augustine
xxviii, 16-20	Friday within Octave of Easter . .	Jerome
xxviii, 18-20	Trinity Sunday	Gregory Nazianzen

II. GOSPEL OF ST. MARK

vi, 17-29	Beheading of St. John the Baptist, 29th Aug.	Augustine
vi, 47-56	Saturday after Ash Wednesday . .	Bede
vii, 31-37	11th Sunday after Pentecost . .	Gregory the Great
viii, 1-9	6th Sunday after Pentecost . .	Ambrose
ix, 16-28	Ember Wednesday of September	Bede
x, 13-21	St. Gabriel, 27th Feb.	"
x, 15-21	St. Anthony, 5th July	Augustine
xi, 22-24	St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, 17th Nov.	Bede
xvi, 1-7	Easter Sunday	Gregory the Great
xvi, 14-20	Ascension	"
"	Friday within Octave of the Ascension	"
"	Saturday within Octave of the Ascension	"
"	Monday within Octave of the Ascension	"
"	Tuesday within Octave of the Ascension	"
"	Wednesday within Octave of the Ascension	"
"	Octave of Ascension	"
xvi, 15-18	St. Francis Xavier, 3rd Dec. . .	"

III. GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE

i, 5-17	Vigil of St. John the Baptist, 23rd June	Ambrose
---------	---	---------

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
i, 26-38	Holy Name of Mary, 12th Sept.	Chrysologus
"	Holy Rosary, 7th Oct. . . .	Bernard
"	Immaculate Conception, 8th Dec.	Germanus
"	" Octave, 2nd Day . . .	Sophronius
"	" " 3rd Day . . .	Bernard
"	" " 5th Day . . .	Tharasius
"	" " 7th Day . . .	Sophronius
"	" Octave Day . . .	Epiphanius
"	St. Gabriel, 24th March . . .	Bernard
"	Ember Wednesday of 3rd Week of Advent	Ambrose
i, 39-47	Visitation, 2nd July	"
"	Ember Friday of 3rd Week of Advent	"
i, 57-58	Nativity of St. John the Baptist, 24th June	"
"	Nativity of St. John the Baptist, Octave, 4th Day	"
ii, 1-14	Christmas Day	Gregory the Great
ii, 15-20	Christmas Day	Ambrose
"	" " Octave, 6th Day . . .	"
ii, 21	Circumcision, 1st Jan. . . .	"
"	Holy Name of Jesus, Sunday with- in Octave of Circumcision and Epiphany	Bernard
ii, 22-32	Purification, 2nd Feb. . . .	Ambrose
ii, 33-40	Sunday within Octave of Christ- mas	"
ii, 42-52	Sunday within Octave of Epiphany	"
ii, 43-51	Maternity of Our Lady, 11th Oct.	Bernard
iii, 1-6	Ember Saturday of 3rd Week of Advent	Gregory the Great
"	4th Sunday of Advent	"
iii, 21-23	Solemnity of St. Joseph, April . .	Augustine
"	" Octave, 2nd Day	"
"	" " 3rd Day	"
"	" " 4th Day	Ambrose
"	" " 6th Day	"
"	" " 7th Day	Damascene
"	" Octave Day	Augustine
iv, 23-30	Monday in 3rd Week of Lent . .	Ambrose
iv, 38-44	Thursday in 3rd Week of Lent . .	"
v, 1-11	4th Sunday after Pentecost . . .	"

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
v, 17-26	Ember Friday of Pentecost ..	Ambrose
v, 27-32	Vigil of St. Matthew, 20th Sept.	"
vi, 6-11	St. John Damascene, 27th March	Chrysologus
vi, 12-19	St. Bartholomew, 24th Aug. ..	Ambrose
vi, 17-23	Common of Many Martyrs, II ..	"
vii, 11-16	Thursday in 4th Week of Lent ..	Augustine
"	15th Sunday after Pentecost ..	"
vii, 36-50	Thursday in Passion Week ..	Gregory the Great
"	St. Mary Magdalene, 22nd July ..	Augustine
"	Ember Friday of September ..	Gregory the Great
viii, 4-15	Sexagesima Sunday	"
ix, 1-6	Thursday in Octave of Pentecost	Ambrose
"	St. John of Capistrano, 28th March	Bonaventure
x, 1-9	Common of Evangelists	Gregory the Great
x, 23-37	12th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Bede
x, 38-42	Assumption, 15th Aug.	Augustine
"	" Octave, 4th Day	"
"	" " 5th Day	"
"	" Octave Day	Bernard
"	St. Martha, 29th July	Augustine
xi, 5-13	Rogation Monday, 5th Week after Easter	Ambrose
xi, 14-28	3rd Sunday of Lent	Bede
xi, 27-28	Common of B.V.M.	"
xi, 33-36	St. Martin, 11th Nov.	Ambrose
xii, 1-8	Common of Many Martyrs, III ..	Bede
xii, 2-8	St. Justin Martyr, 14th April ..	Chrysostom
xii, 32-34	Common of Confessor not Pont., II	Bede
xii, 32-34	St. Paulinus, 22nd June	Paulinus
xii, 35-40	Common of Confessor not Pont.	Gregory the Great
xiii, 6-7	Ember Saturday in September ..	"
xiv, 1-11	16th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Augustine
xiv, 16-24	Sunday within Octave of Corpus Christi	"
xiv, 26-33	Common of One Martyr	Gregory the Great
xiv, 26-35	St. Basil, 14th June	Basil
xv, 1-10	3rd Sunday after Pentecost ..	Gregory the Great
xvi, 1-9	8th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Jerome
xvi, 11-32	Saturday of 2nd Week in Lent ..	Ambrose
xvi, 19-31	Thursday in 2nd week of Lent ..	Gregory the Great
xvii, 11-19	13th Sunday after Pentecost ..	Augustine
xviii, 9-14	10th Sunday after Pentecost ..	"
xviii, 31-3	Quinquagesima Sunday	Gregory the Great

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
xix, 1-19	Dedication of a Church	Ambrose
"	" Octave, 2nd Day	"
"	" " 3rd Day	"
"	" " 4th Day	Maximus
"	" " 5th Day	Bede
"	" " 6th Day	"
"	" " 7th Day	"
"	" Octave Day	Gregory the Great
xix, 12-26	St. Louis, 25th Aug.	Ambrose
xix, 41-47	11th Sunday after Pentecost	Gregory the Great
xxi, 9-19	Common of Many Martyrs	"
xxi, 25-33	1st Sunday of Advent	"
xxii, 24-30	St. Apollinaris, 23rd July	Ambrose
xxiv, 13-35	Monday within Octave of Easter	Gregory the Great
xxiv, 36-47	Tuesday within Octave of Easter	Ambrose

IV. GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

i, 1-14	Christmas Day	Augustine
i, 19-28	3rd Sunday of Advent	Gregory the Great
i, 29-34	Octave of Epiphany	Augustine
i, 35-51	Vigil of St. Andrew, 29th Nov.	"
ii, 1-11	2nd Sunday after the Epiphany	"
ii, 13-25	Monday of 4th Week in Lent	"
iii, 1-15	Finding of the True Cross, 3rd May	"
iii, 16-21	Monday within the Octave of Pentecost	"
iv, 5-42	Friday in 3rd Week of Lent	"
iv, 46-53	20th Sunday after Pentecost	Gregory the Great
"	SS. Nereus, Achilleus and Others, 12th May	"
v, 1-4	St. Raphael, 24th Oct.	Chrysostom
v, 1-15	Ember Friday in Lent	Augustine
vi, 1-15	4th Sunday in Lent	"
vi, 44-52	Ember Wednesday in Lent	"
vi, 56-59	Corpus Christi	"
"	" Friday within Octave	"
"	" Saturday within Octave	"
"	" Monday within Octave	"
"	" Tuesday within Octave	"
"	" Wed. within Octave	Hilary
"	" Octave Day	Cyril of Alex.

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
vii, 1-13	Tuesday in Passion Week ..	Augustine
vii, 14-31	Tuesday in 4th Week of Lent ..	"
vii, 32-39	Monday in Passion Week ..	"
viii, 1-11	Saturday in 3rd Week of Lent ..	"
viii, 12-20	Saturday in 4th Week of Lent ..	"
viii, 21-29	Monday in 2nd Week of Lent ..	"
viii, 45-59	Passion Sunday	Gregory the Great
ix, 1-38	Wednesday in 4th Week of Lent ..	Augustine
x, 1-10	Tuesday in Octave of Pentecost ..	"
x, 11-16	St. Thomas, 29th Dec.	Chrysostom
"	2nd Sunday after Easter	Gregory the Great
x, 22-38	Wednesday in Passion Week ..	Augustine
x, 23-30	St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More, 9th July	Bede
xi, 1-45	Friday in 4th Week of Lent ..	Augustine
xi, 47-54	Friday in Passion Week	"
xii, 1-9	Monday of Holy Week	"
xii, 10-36	Saturday in Passion Week ..	"
xii, 24-26	St. Ignatius Martyr, 1st Feb. ..	"
xii, 31-36	Exaltation of the Holy Cross, 14th Sept.	Leo the Great
xiv, 1-13	SS. Philip and James, 1st May ..	Augustine
xiv, 15-21	Saturday, Vigil of Pentecost ..	"
xiv, 23-31	Pentecost	Gregory the Great
xv, 1-7	Common of One or Many Martyrs in Paschal Time	Augustine
xv, 5-11	Common of One or Many Martyrs in Paschal Time, II	"
xv, 12-16	Vigil of Apostles	Gregory the Great
"	St. Camillus de Lellis, 18th July ..	Augustine
xv, 17-25	SS. Simon and Jude, 28th Oct. ..	"
xv, 26-	Sunday within Octave of Ascen- sion	"
xvi, 4	Friday after Octave of Ascension ..	"
"	4th Sunday after Easter	"
xvi, 5-14	3rd Sunday after Easter	"
xvi, 16-22	5th Sunday after Easter	"
xvi, 23-30	Rogation Wednesday, Vigil of As- cension	"
xvii, 1-11	Christ the King. Last Sunday of October	"
xviii, 33-37	Seven Dolours, 15th Sept. ..	Ambrose
xix, 25-27	" " Friday after Passion Sunday ..	Augustine

<i>Text</i>	<i>Commentary</i>	<i>Author</i>
xix, 30-35	Precious Blood, 1st July	Augustine
xx, 1-19	Low Saturday	Gregory the Great
xx, 11-18	Thursday within Octave of Easter	"
xx, 19-31	Low Sunday	"
xx, 24-29	St. Thomas, Apostle, 21st Dec. ..	"
xxi, 1-14	Wednesday within Octave of Easter	"
xxi, 15-19	Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul, 28th June	Augustine
xxi, 19-24	St. John, 27th Dec.	"

JAMES MACDONALD.

HELPS TO THE USE OF THE BREVIARY

(VII) TIME AFTER PENTECOST

(a) *Corpus Christi. The Sacred Heart. St. John the Baptist. SS. Peter and Paul.*

THE *Liturgy of Love*.—In former "Helps" we have already considered the "Liturgy of Light" (Christmastide) and the "Liturgy of Life" (Eastertide); it is now the turn of the "Liturgy of Love", which corresponds to the time of Pentecost and rounds off the Liturgical Cycle. Love is the bond of perfection, or, to put it more accurately, it is perfection itself; and in the wonderful presentment of the intimate relations between God and His Church, known to us as the Liturgical Year, the burden of love—of God's love for man and of man's love for God—finds its fitting expression in the feasts of the pentecostal season, which are the consummation and completion of the whole cycle.

The theme of love is, in fact, the characteristic of Whitsun and of the two solemn festivals with their respective octaves which closely follow in its wake—Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart. The motive of the Church in adding, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, these two latter feasts in relatively recent times to the Liturgy, when the cycle of solemnities could already be considered as fully formed, is precisely this: to remind the faithful of the ineffable love the God-Man bears His fellow men and to pay back on their behalf a corresponding measure of grateful understanding and love.

In the words of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Holy Eucharist was instituted by Christ to impress upon us "the boundless extent of His most excellent love" (*immensitas suae excellentissimae charitatis*).¹ In practice, love is the

¹ Feast of Corpus Christi, 2nd Noct., 3rd lesson.

utter giving of self, and, as St. Thomas had described it in one of the most inspired hymns of the Breviary, Christ's Incarnation simply means His giving Himself to us completely and continually, in time and in eternity:

Se nascens dedit socium,
Convalescens in edulium,
Se moriens in pretium,
Se regnans dat in præmium.

—in birth as a companion,
in the Eucharist as food,
on the Cross as ransom,
in heaven as reward.

Nowhere in the Liturgy is there a better presentment of Christ's love for man. From the literary point of view alone this stanza is a pure gem of poetical achievement. The Spanish poet Calderón was wont to say that he would readily have given all his writings for the authorship of just this one stanza.

The Offices of both Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart are a golden chain of scriptural and patristic texts extolling in fitting words the principal object of the two feasts: the grateful acknowledgement and loving worship of the love of the Word made Flesh. St. John Chrysostom writes:¹

Propterea semetipsum nobis immiscuit, et corpus suum in nos contemperavit, ut unum quid simus tamquam corpus capiti cooptatum: *ardenter enim amantium hoc est,*

To this end He has mingled Himself with us and infused His body into us, that we may be one with Him, as a body is fitted to its head: *for lovers ardently thirst for such union,*

and St. Bonaventure:²

Propterea vulneratum est, ut per vulnus visibile vulnus amoris invisibile videamus.

For this reason was it wounded that, through the visible wound, we might see the invisible wound of love.

The proper hymns of the feast repeat this thought over and again. Thus, the whole of the hymn at Lauds on the Feast of the Sacred Heart is evidently derived from St. Bonaventure's homily. For example:

Te vulneratum caritas
Ictu patenti voluit,
Amoris invisibilis
Ut veneremur vulnera.

Thy love hath willed that Thou be wounded with an open wound; that we may venerate the wounds of Thy invisible love.

In the hymn of Vespers the Liturgy of Love has inspired these lines:

Amor coegit te tuus
Mortale corpus sumere
Ut novus Adam redderes
Quod vetus ille abstulerat.

Thy love hath forced Thee to put on a mortal body; that, as the new Adam, Thou mayest restore what the old Adam took away.

The hymn then goes on to sing divine Love, as the best artist (*Ille Amor almus artifex*) who, by his fostering care, delicately fashioned the human Heart of Christ as the organ of ineffable love.

There is another aspect of the Liturgy of Love, viz. divine love con-

¹ Saturday within the Octave, 2nd Noct., 1st lesson.

² Feast of the Sacred Heart, 3rd Noct., 3rd lesson.

sidered in its most glorious effects, i.e. in the splendid pageant of Saints who, down these twenty centuries, have passed by the Cross and looked with loving gaze on the open wound of their crucified Lord, sharing in His sacrifice and thus achieving sanctity. All liturgical seasons celebrate the heroic exploits of the Saints; but in the time after Pentecost, which is the longest of all, the procession of the Saints, led by their Queen in her triumphant Assumption, naturally looms largest in the liturgical cycle. They are "the ripe fruit of the Spirit", "the victims conquered and consumed by the fire of Love Divine". They are an apt illustration of the Liturgy of Love.

The Birthday of St. John the Baptist.—Chronologically, the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord's Forerunner was the very first among those of the Saints to be celebrated by the Church universal. As a separate feast it preceded the institution of any of the various festivals in honour of Our Lady. A great impetus was given to the cult of St. John the Baptist by the finding of the Saint's relics in the fourth century, as well as by the fact that, besides being honoured as a Martyr, he was venerated from the very beginnings of both the eremitical and the coenobitic life as the Patron Saint of hermits and monks. The day assigned to St. John's birth depends, of course, on that chosen for Christmas. According to the Roman reckoning, Christ was born on the *octave day* before the Kalends of January (*VIII Kal Jan.—Dec. 25*), and St. John on the *octave day* before the Kalends of July (*VIII Kal. July—June 24*).

One of the reasons why St. John's birth was solemnized with a yearly festival is given by the Liturgy, which applies to the Baptist the words said by God to Jeremias¹:

Antequam exires de ventre sanctificavi
te, et Prophetam in gentibus dedi te.

Before thou camest forth out of the
womb, I sanctified thee, and sent thee a
prophet unto the nations.

Another reason is mentioned by St. Ambrose in today's homily: "The birth of Saints brings joy to many" (*Habet Sanctorum editio laetitiam plurimorum*).² These words echo those of the Gospel: "Many shall rejoice in his nativity" (*Multi in nativitate ejus gaudebunt*). In the Middle Ages, and indeed in several Catholic countries until recent times, this text was interpreted quite literally and gave rise to the bonfires and other similar demonstrations of popular rejoicing described by Dom Guéranger³ and Dom Schuster.⁴ In past ages the cult of St. John the Baptist was more popular than that of any other Saint, both in the Eastern and Western Churches.⁵

¹ 1st Noct., 1st lesson *et alibi*. (See Jer. i, 4.)

² 3rd Noct., 1st lesson.

³ *The Liturgical Year*, h. i.

⁴ *Liber Sacramentorum*, Vol. VII, pp. 274 sqq.

⁵ In the sixth century there were at Constantinople fifteen churches and chapels dedicated to St. John the Baptist (Morcelli, *Menol. Const.*, ii, 13 sqq.). As a proof of the popularity of St. John's cult it may be mentioned that his name has always been the most frequently given in Baptism. For instance: there are over 300 among the Saints and Beati of the Catholic Church named John. No less than 73 of the post-Reformation English Martyrs—1 canonized, 48 Beati, 19 Venerabiles, 5 Dilati—were called John. Among the popes, too, 22 (or 23) were also called John. It is the Precursor, not the Evangelist, who is mainly responsible for this popularity.

Even among the Moors St. John's Birthday became a yearly festival. The thirteenth-century Spanish poem *Gazul* terms it: "The feast which is holy among the Moors" (*La fiesta entre moros santa*). St. John still commands the veneration of the faithful and his name comes next to that of Our Lady and the Angels in the liturgical litanies and other prayers.

At one time in Rome four Masses were said on this day in honour of the Baptist, the last—that sung in the Baptistry by the Lateran—being surrounded with special splendour. In most places outside Rome only three were said. Soon ecclesiastical writers began to look for a reason to explain this custom, and they found it in the fact that St. John deserved a three-fold crown as a Martyr, a Hermit and a Prophet. John indeed came, as the Fourth Gospel tells us: *εἰς μαρτυρίαν*—to be a martyr, a witness, and, moreover, he died a Martyr's death; he is therefore a *Praepotens Martyr*. Secondly, he is the model of hermits—*Nemorum Cultor*, or, as the original reading has it, *Eremita Cultor*. Lastly, he is, as Our Lord stated, the greatest in the series of prophets, which he brings to a close—*Maximus Vatum*.

These are the three titles given to the Saint in the Hymn of Lauds. A word must be said about this hymn and its two companions of Vespers and Matins, which originally formed only one hymn. It was composed by the Benedictine monk of Monte Cassino, Paul Warnefrid, known also as Paul the Deacon (*d. c. 799*) for liturgical use in the Abbey Church, which St. Benedict had dedicated to St. John the Baptist, the Patron Saint of monastic life. From Monte Cassino the hymn spread to the whole Western Church. A few of the stanzas are somewhat involved; yet, even so, the hymn deserves consideration as probably the best specimen of metrical composition of the Carolingian renaissance.

The Feast of SS. Peter and Paul.—We venture to say that the two features of this feast in the Roman Breviary which, more than any other, appeal to priests are the Vesper Hymn and St. Leo the Great's lessons in the 2nd Nocturn. The hymn is, as it were, an echo of St. Leo's magnificent phrases. Like Mgr. Knox, I too "should like to have heard St. Leo preaching that 2nd Nocturn sermon":¹

Isti enim sunt viri, per quos tibi Evangelium Christi, Roma, resplenduit: et quae eras magistra erroris, facta es discipula veritatis. . . . Isti sunt, qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotialis et regia, per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius praesideres religione divina, quam dominatione terrena.

These are the men through whom, O Rome, the Gospel of Christ shone upon thee: and thou, from being the teacher of error, hast become the disciple of truth. . . . These are they who have raised thee to this glory, to be indeed a holy race, a chosen people, a priestly and royal city, made the ruler of the world through the sacred Chair of blessed Peter and ruling a wider realm by a divine religion than by earthly dominions.

The proper hymn *Decora Lux* is usually attributed to Elpis (*d. c. 493*), the wife of St. Severinus Boethius, the philosopher, martyred by the Ostrogothic King Theodoric in 525. There is no reason why this authorship should be gainsaid. We draw attention to the most famous stanza:

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, Sept., p. 395.

O Roma felix, quae duorum Principum
Es consecrata glorioso sanguine:
Horum cruore purpurata caeteras
Excellis orbis una pulchritudines.

O happy Rome, hallowed by the
glorious blood of those two Princes!
Empurpled by their blood, thou alone
surpasseth all the beauties of the universe.

Before closing this note, we cannot resist adding a few lines on the glorious group of Roman Martyrs of the Apostolic age, martyred under Nero. The Roman Martyrology (24 June) devotes to them the following graphic *laus*:

Romae commemoratio sanctorum Martyrum, qui a Nerone Imperatore, ut a se incensae Urbis odium averteret, calumniose accusati, diverso mortis genere jussi sunt saevissime interfici. "Horum siquidem alii, ferarum tergis contacti, laniatibus canum expositi sunt; alii crucibus affixi; alii incendio traditi, ut, ubi defecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis deservirent." Erant hi omnes Apostolorum discipuli et primitiae Martyrum, quos Romana ecclesia, fertilis ager Martyrum, ante Apostolorum necem, transmisit ad Dominum.

At Rome, the commemoration of very many holy Martyrs, who, under the Emperor Nero, were falsely charged with the burning of the city, and ordered to be slain by divers kinds of most cruel deaths. "Some of them were covered with the skins of wild beasts and cast to the dogs to be torn; others were crucified; others were delivered over to death by fire, and when the daylight failed, were used as a means of giving light in the night-time." All these were disciples of the Apostles, and the first fruits of the Martyrs whom the Roman Church, ever a fertile field of Martyrs, sent to the Lord before the Apostles' death.

This *laus* is a little masterpiece of restrained eloquence. It may be added that the sentences which we have enclosed within inverted commas have been transcribed almost verbatim from a contemporary pagan source,¹ viz. the *Annals* of Tacitus, written between A.D. 98 and 117.

The Common of Martyrs outside Paschaltide.—The Breviary has two Offices in honour of the Martyrs whose feasts occur outside Paschaltide, namely for a single Martyr and for groups of Martyrs. The latter was composed at an earlier date than the former and is also more original and inspired. As there is no space for more, we shall here content ourselves with pointing out the leading thought of which both Offices are full, viz. Christ considered as the King and Crown of Martyrs:

Rex gloriose Martyrum,
Corona confitentium.

O glorious King of Martyrs, and Crown
of those who bear witness to Thee!

Deus, tuorum militum
Sors et corona, praemium.

O God, Thou who art the portion, the
crown and the reward of thy soldiers!

That Crown is the coveted trophy of Martyrdom:

Trophaea sacra pangimus.

We sing of sacred trophies.

¹ Tacitus's words are these: "Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos . . . quos . . . vulgus Chrestianos appellabat . . . et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contacti laniatu canum interirent, multi crucibus affixi sunt aut flamma usti, alique, ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur." (*Annales*, 15, 44.)

The description of that Crown, as given in the Office of Martyrs, suggests that the Liturgy has ransacked the Bible for all the crowns which can be found mentioned there in order to place them on the heads of the Martyrs. Theirs is

- a Crown of life—*accipiet coronam vitae*;
- a Crown of honour and glory—*gloria et honore coronasti eum; coronas decoris meruerunt de manu Dei*;
- a Crown of victory—*coronas triumphales meruerunt*;
- a Crown of beauty—*coronam pulchritudinis posuit super caput ejus*;
- an eternal Crown—*meruerunt habere coronas perpetuas*;
- the Crown of God's favour—*scuto bonae voluntatis tuae coronasti eum*;
- a Crown of precious gems—*posuisti in capite ejus coronam de lapide pretioso*;
- a Crown which symbolizes all that is holy and beautiful and worthy of honour—*Corona aurea super caput ejus, expressa signo sanctitatis, gloria honoris et opus fortitudinis*.

The Martyrs are "the noblest race of victors" (*Victorum genus optimum*); their victory leads them to life eternal: "Crowned, they bear their palm" (*Coronati possident palmam*). As their Crown is Christ, it follows that Christ is their perfect and complete and eternal beatitude. Truly: *Se regnans dat in praemium*.

The Office of Martyrs is plain and straightforward, excepting perhaps a passage from St. Ambrose in the first of the alternative homilies for the Feast of Many Martyrs. It is to be found in the eighth lesson, which ends with these words:

Sicut enim spei nostrae octava perfectio est, ita octava summa virtutum est.

For as "the octave" is the perfection of our hope, so also it is the sum of all virtues.

Octava means here "a group of eight" and was at one time a common term for the Beatitudes, and therefore, as above, for eternal beatitude, so that Fr. Sutcliffe, S.J., rightly comments on this passage as follows:¹ "The world to come will exhibit all virtues in their highest perfection, and all virtues are summed up in the eight beatitudes proposed by Our Lord." The homily seems to have been introduced into the Breviary at the time of Alcuin's revision of the Western liturgical books. That *octava* stands for "eternal happiness" was still known to the liturgiologists of the twelfth century, as may be inferred from Rupert of Deutz.²

The Psalms in the Lives of the Saints.—In his Bull, *Divino Afflatu*, on the reform of the Breviary, Pope Pius X wrote these remarkable words: "There is in the psalms a wonderful power to stir up in the soul the love of all virtues." Among the many patristic quotations which the saintly Pontiff transcribes to enhance the frequent and loving use of the psalms, there is this from St. Augustine:³ "In order that God may be worthily praised by man, God praised Himself beforehand; and because God deigned to

¹ In a very interesting paper contributed to the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1939, June, pp. 620-9.

² Rupert, Tuit., P.L., T. 170, c. 198 *et alibi*.

³ In Psalm 144, n. 1.

praise Himself, man now knows how to praise God in God's own words." No wonder that the tradition of the Church has always attached such importance and value to the daily, even hourly, recitation of the psalms. They are, in the phrase of Raoul of Tongres, the *Summarium totius Theologiæ*; not indeed of a dry and stereotyped theology, but of a theology ever alive and ever fresh, welling up from the fountain-spring of divine inspiration.

Christ affords us the most convincing example for the frequent use of the psalms. He quoted them to overcome the devil, to prove His own divinity against scribes and Pharisees, and, above all, when dying on the Cross. The Saints followed His example. The Breviary records a number of cases of Saints meeting death with the words of the psalms on their lips. If, as psychologists tell us, at the hour of death man speaks out his inmost thoughts and reveals that with which his mind has been most preoccupied in life, the use of a particular verse of the psalms at that supreme moment proves unmistakably that the dying man had during life been profoundly influenced by—had indeed made his own—the psalmist's thought.

Here are some examples from the 2nd Nocturn of various Saints:

St. Nicholas of Myra (6 Dec.):

Looking up to heaven, and seeing Angels coming to meet him, he began the psalm: *In te Domine speravi*; and having come to these words: *In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum*, his soul took its flight to the heavenly country.

St. Peter Nolasco (31 Jan.):

Devoutly reciting the psalm: *Confitebor tibi Domine in toto corde meo*, at the words: *Redemptionem misit Dominus populo suo*, he gave up his soul to God.

St. Gregory VII (25 May):

The last words of the dying Pontiff were: *Dilexi justitiam et odivi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio*.

St. John Gualbert (12 July):

During his last malady, he very frequently repeated those words of David: *Sitivit anima mea ad Deum fortem, vivum; quando veniam et apparebo ante faciem Domini?*

St. Hyacinth (17 Aug.):

With these words: *In manus tuas, Domine*, he gave up his soul to God.

St. Louis of France (25 Aug.):

He died of the pestilence while saying this prayer: *Introibo in domum tuam, adorabo ad templum sanctum tuum et confitebor nomini tuo*.

St. Augustine (28 Aug.):

When he realized that his departure from this life was fast approaching, he had the penitential psalms of David placed before him, and read them with an abundance of tears.

St. Francis of Assisi (4 Oct.):

Reciting the psalm, *Voce mea ad Dominum clamavi*; at the verse: *Me expectant justi donec retribuas mihi*, he breathed forth his soul.

St. Andrew Avellino (10 Nov.):

He was celebrating at the altar when, having for the third time said the words: *Introibo ad altare Dei*, he suddenly fell down struck with apoplexy.

St. John of the Cross (24 Nov.):

After saying those words: *In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum*, he fell asleep in the Lord.

St. Bede the Venerable (27 May) supplies the *Gloria Patri*:

While he was repeating these words: *Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto*, he died in the Lord.

We have quoted only the cases recorded in the Breviary, but there are, of course, hundreds of others. Particularly touching are several found in

the Acts of the Martyrs. Here is one from our own English Menology: On 27 February, 1601, Blessed Mark Barkworth, O.S.B., and the Ven. Roger Filcock, S.J., suffered together at Tyburn. While, bound together on the same hurdle, they were being drawn through the streets, and again when they arrived at Tyburn, the Benedictine kept intoning the verse, *Haec dies quam fecit Dominus*, to which the Jesuit gave answer: *Exultemus et laetemur in ea!*; and again the Benedictine: *Gaudeamus, gaudeamus, gaudeamus!*

It is true that there are passages in the psalms difficult to understand, but they are by far outnumbered by those which are "pure music to the ear and honey and honeycomb to the soul". The psalter, recited with understanding and proper devotion, is indeed a short cut to heaven. It is our great privilege as priests daily to invite the whole of creation to praise God in words inspired by God. A priest cannot but feel proud of his dignity when he closes his prayer of praise with the concluding words of the psalter: *Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum*.

ROMANUS RIOS, O.S.B.

SERMON NOTES

FURTHER DEVOTIONAL NOTES ON THE HAIL MARY

IV

BENEDICTA TU IN MULIERIBUS

(1) *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*. Throughout the whole Bible story not only is God portrayed as bestowing countless blessings upon the human race, but also as bestowing special blessings on all those who were to play a great part in His work: Noe, Abraham, Moses, etc. God loves to bless; blessing flows from His very nature, for His nature is goodness and His every act is love. God is all loving-kindness, an infinite tenderness, an inexhaustible benevolence. These attributes are diffusive of themselves; like the waters of a flood they spread themselves abroad, and when checked by an obstacle their tendency is to overcome it. Saint Paul was undoubtedly thinking much of the love of God when he wrote his great eulogy on charity (I Cor. xiii). All the Old Testament is looking forward to Christ; and all this outpouring reaches its climax in the Incarnation. In and through Our Blessed Lord the whole human race is blessed: "In thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed" refers to Him (Gen. xxii, 16-18).

(2) *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*. The Ave Maria is like a perfect flower, its every unfolding petal is filled with beauty. Above all others, is Mary blessed by God. None in all the world can compare with her. All God's blessings up to that moment are brought to a focus in Mary; great is her blessedness indeed, for she is "Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called

Christ". So it was that the Angel of the Annunciation saluted her as Blessed; Saint Elizabeth at the Visitation, "filled with the Holy Ghost", sang with joy of heart: "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." And Mary said: "My soul doth magnify the Lord . . . behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." So, too, much later, the woman in the crowd cried out in ecstasy: "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee" (Luke xi, 27). "Thy children shall rise up and call thee blessed!" And so she comes down the ages as the Blessed Virgin Mary.

It was because of her great blessedness as Mother of God that all other blessings descended on Mary: grace, love, beauty, humility, virginity, purity, faith, and the like. *All* that was fitting for her, and all that was worthy of the benevolence of God.

(3) *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*. When the Angel had reminded Mary that she was all God's work, that she was dearly loved, and was and would be blessed, he paused. He knew that Mary would understand that she was declared blessed, not only because of her fulness of grace, not only because God was with her more closely than with any other, but because of the reason for these gifts, a reason which was not yet disclosed, but which was to make her blessed among and above all other women, and for ever.

To Jewish ears that blessing could mean but *one* thing, and that one thing was the Hope of Israel, the realization of all their history, and indeed of the whole world.

Many an Angel had come from heaven to announce the birth of a child, but never quite like this. No wonder Mary trembled, and needed the help of the "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace with God"; and as all her being prostrated itself in wonder that she was the chosen one of God, chosen for that great thing for which every Israelite maiden had sighed and prayed, she knew within herself how that message would continue: "Behold thou shalt conceive", etc.

Her vow of chastity had seemed to prohibit her ever sharing the hope of her companions, and now it appeared as the provision of God to that end. See Saint Bernard, Hom. iii, *Missus est*: "Who has taught thee, O prudent Virgin . . . that virginity is pleasing to God? What page of the Old Testament exhorted thee?" etc.

(4) "Blessed art thou that hast believed" (so Saint Elizabeth at the Visitation), "for all things shall be accomplished." Mary had already conceived of the Holy Ghost, and was Mother of God! That was the central blessing, but many things would flow from it, and would in God's time be accomplished—"because thou hast believed". In our little way we share this blessing with Mary, and though "all things" may not be accomplished in us which were in the holy plan of God for us, yet we trust that, through Mary's potent intercession, at any rate the essentials may be fulfilled. But in Mary, peerless Mary, *all* God's purposes came true, because Mary's heart was absolutely single, and every fibre of her being was His. *Utinam!* There was no discrepancy in Mary between God's plan and its fulfilment.

(5) "Behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." A royal proclamation! Never before was a creature, never before was this earth, so blessed, and with such an overflowing blessing. All generations shall drink at the Virgin's fountain and shall call her blessed. "I will put

enmities between thee and the Woman, between thy seed and her seed": for the Woman and her Child bring blessing, the devil and his votaries a curse. "Blessed is the womb that bore thee," exclaimed the woman in the crowd to Our Blessed Lord, and she represents the voice of "all generations". "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it," replied Our Lord. And so again is the way laid open for Mary's children to share in the blessedness of their holy Mother. "Quinimmo beati qui audiunt verbum Dei et custodiunt. Pulchre Salvator attestationi mulieris annuit, non eam tantummodo quae Verbum Dei corporaliter generare meruerat, sed et omnes qui idem Verbum spiritualiter auditu concipere, et boni operis custodia . . . corde parere et quasi alere studuerint, asseverans esse beatos" (Hom. S^ti Bedae Venerabilis. Comm. Festorum B.M.V.).

(6) *Benedicta tu in mulieribus*. Who can count her blessings? Who can number her graces? Who can tell her glory? Count, if you can, her shrines, her feasts, all those who have obtained graces, have been rescued from despair, whose faith has been saved, or who have been helped in trials, and all of whom lift grateful hands to heaven, and call her blessed! Blessed be the great Mother of God, Mary most holy!

V

BENEDICTUS FRUCTUS VENTRIS TUI JESUS

(1) *Benedictus fructus ventris tui Jesus*. Saint Elizabeth, "filled with the Holy Ghost", gave us this phrase of the Ave Maria. The Angel Gabriel had already said it—and not very long before, for Our Lady's journey had been made with haste—but at much greater length. "Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son: and thou shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great . . ." (Luke i, 31-33). We are at the very heart of our Catholic faith. The mystery that was invisible at the Annunciation became visible at Christmas, and from childhood to old age we kneel before the crib, and adore the mystery of God made man. Those outside the Church can, and sometimes do, put up a crib, but they fail to draw the kneeling crowds to be found day after day before the poorest and humblest representation in a Catholic church. Surprise and perhaps annoyance was once expressed to a priest about this. "Ah!" he said sadly, "yes, you have the finer crib, but you see, *we have the Child!*" He might have added: "And the Mother, too." It's just that; we have the Child, we have Him always, and Mary brings Him to us now, as she gave Him to the whole world then. The procession of those who adore in humble loving faith, that began when the shepherds "found Mary and Joseph and the Infant lying in a manger", will only cease when time shall be no more.

(2) "They found the Child with Mary His Mother, and falling down they adored Him." The end of the quest; the Magi had followed the Star, "until it came and stood over where the Child was". That guiding Star still shines in the darkness of the world, and it is the faith of the Catholic Church. That faith alone has taken two ideas—Eternal God and Mary's Child—and

blended them into one, so that all generations adore that Child. For that Child dominates all history, as He also is the subject of all the Scriptures from Genesis to the Apocalypse. He is the Child of the Woman that was promised at the Fall in the Garden of Eden, and He is the Child of the sun-clothed, star-crowned Woman of the Apocalypse (xii, 1-17), the Child who was to rule all nations with an iron rod, and was taken up to God and to His throne.

That is the vision which has caught the imagination of artists ever since, and we meet with it in ikons, and pictures, and statues: Mary in glory, crowned and radiant, but Jesus still as her Child in His Mother's arms. That image, or that thought, always has power to pull at our heart-strings: Mary crowned in beauty, in her left hand the golden sceptre of the mercy of God; *Virgo potens*, *Virgo clemens*, Mary powerful in mercy, and the mercy of God powerful in Mary, for the whole group stands for the infinite mercy of God, and is caused by it. And on His Mother's right arm rests Jesus—for ever, Mary's Child; His right hand is raised in unending blessing, and in His left hand He holds the orb of Dominion, emblem of His kingly reign; for "of His Kingdom there shall be no end". We have a right to that statue, and to our emotions, only if we recognize the significance of that kingly orb, only if Jesus is our King, and is to us in our measure all that He was to His Mother, so that, opening our *treasures* we offer Him gifts. It is the wonderful truth that that winsome Child in Mary's arms is the Eternal God, that so melts and moves us. Not only does it never grow old, but the amazing wonder of it grows till we can hardly breathe. "Love so amazing, so divine, demands my soul, my life, my all."

(3) "Blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus." He is the true Vine, we are the branches; the condition of our bearing fruit is that we abide in the Vine—"Grant that by the mystery of this water and wine, we may be made partakers of His divinity, who vouchsafed to become partaker of our humanity." "In this is my Father glorified: that you bring forth *very much fruit*, and become my disciples." It is when our life produces, and when from all our life God gathers the fruit—our adoration—that God is glorified. And this adoration is highest and most perfect when we are completely the Lord's disciples, taught, guided, determined by Him; when there remains in us nothing that is not Himself, or His. Then there rises to the Father the homage of complete adoration, because it is that of Christ in us.

So does this precious *fruit*, that drew its human sustenance from Mary, become the *Antidote* to the poison of that Forbidden fruit that hung in Eden. "Blessed is the womb that bore thee and the paps that gave thee suck." That precious fruit was our life and our healing when He yet lay in the soft embraces of Mary's arms, but more openly was He our life when He hung as the fruit on that hard tree, the Holy Cross. You shall see your life hanging before you. No other tree brings forth such fruit, in leaf, and flower, and bud. See the lovely Passiontide hymns:

Dulce ferrum, dulce lignum,
Dulce pondus sustinet.

Flecte ramos, arbor alta,
Tensa laxa viscera.

From Calvary our thoughts go on to where the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father, where flows the river of the water of life, clear as crystal, that proceeds from the throne of God and of the Lamb. And on both sides of the river is the Tree of Life, and the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations. And a voice comes to us: "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, abideth in Me and I in him." The Antidote!

(4) "Blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus." When Mary gave her consent, it was *absolute*; it was a new dedication of all her powers of mind and body to all that was involved in her becoming Mother of Jesus. In that very moment she became Mother of Jesus, nor has she ever ceased being Mother of Jesus, neither has Jesus ceased being Child of Mary. This thought underlies all devotion to Mary. She became all-Mother, and *all-Mother of Jesus*. There was absolutely *nothing* in Mary that lay outside that relation; nor can there ever be. Wherever the interests of Jesus are to be promoted, or are in any way imperilled, there all her mother-love is focused at once. She is *our* Mother, nor *can* she ever be indifferent to our lot, since we mean so much to Jesus. And, further, Jesus has given to us His Mother that by her intercession His interests in us may be promoted, and may triumph.

It follows that the more Jesus lives and reigns in us, the more are we truly children of Mary. Any conscious trying to attain heaven by Mary's help, by candles, rosaries, or scapulars, if we made no effort to grow in His likeness and to love Him above all, would be doomed to failure. It would be superstition. Jesus may be said to be the necessary "form" of Mary's thought; she can hear and see only what in some way reflects Jesus.

But, given that we do love Her Son, or *want* to love Him, then Mary's power to help us seems to be boundless; and she becomes the quickest and surest way to reach Him. So does she become truly the Mother of Jesus in our souls. She will bring Him forth in us; and His name is Jesus, for He shall save us from our sins.

VI

SANCTA MARIA

(1) *Sancta Maria; Sancta Dei Genetrix; Sancta Virgo Virginum*. So begins the roll of God's saints in the great litanies, and in the same way begins the Litany of Loreto. We salute Mary as holy; many a church is dedicated to Saint Mary; and we praise God at the same time for her holiness. Blessed be the great Mother of God, Mary *most holy*! Blessed be her *holy* and immaculate Conception! And much more might be culled from prayers and hymns. But any angle of approach to the Holy Mother of God leads us at once into the heart of the mystery of the *holy* Incarnation of her great Son. "Per mysterium *sanctae* Incarnationis tuae, libera nos, Domine." One more mystery is called *holy* in the Litany: "Per *sanctam* Resurrectionem tuam," because it is the glorious victory of Our Blessed Lord over sin, and evil, and death. The whole mystery of the Incarnation breathes of holiness, and the means to holiness, and it is holy in its every phase and episode.

(2) "Tu solus Sanctus, Tu solus Dominus, Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe, cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris": that, is Mary's Son!

"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the most High, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father: and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end." And that is spoken of Mary's Son!

"And Mary said to the Angel: How shall this be done? And the Angel said: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." And this also is Mary's Son; and how it came to pass!

To understand Mary's holiness and Mary's greatness one must first understand the holiness and the greatness of Mary's Son, and the holiness of the ineffable and adorable mystery of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Mary by which it came to pass. Folk talk lightly of Mary, who have no real knowledge of Mary's Son. To understand Mary, one must first know Jesus. These particular "notes" are being written on the feast of the Angel Gabriel, and tomorrow will be the Annunciation; hence the emphasis on this aspect of our subject.

Praise to the Holiest in the height,
And in the depth be praise,
In all His words most wonderful,
Most sure in all His ways.

O loving wisdom of our God!
When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight
And to the rescue came.

And that too is written of Mary's Son!

Another picture: "And he was transfigured before them. And his face did shine as the sun: and his garments became white as snow. And behold a bright cloud overshadowed them. And lo, a voice out of the cloud saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye him." And this also is Mary's Son! And the glory is the glory of His holiness as Mary's Child, for the glory of His Godhead they could not see, and live.

Enough has been indicated on this point to rejoice the hearts, and deepen the faith, of a Catholic congregation.

(3) *Sancta Maria*. Easier far to lose oneself in the beauty and holiness that fills the whole mystery of the Incarnation than to try to express in cold and measured words what must have been the holiness of the Ark of the New Testament, purest gold within and without, and over all, the overshadowing of the burning sanctity of the Godhead! *Foederis arca!* O Virgin-Mother, Daughter of thy Son—as Dante makes Saint Bernard say:

Maiden, yet a Mother,
Daughter of thy Son,
High beyond all other,
Lowlier is none;
Thou the consummation
Planned by God's decree
When our lost creation
Nobler rose in thee!

Every word of that lovely stanza indicates the holiness of Mary. If God, when He manifested His presence by means of a burning bush, checked Moses from drawing nearer, "for the ground thou standest on is holy", how can we dare to draw nearer? For we are standing on far holier ground in considering what must have been the holiness of her, who was fore-shadowed by the burning bush: Mary who conceived God within her womb, yet was not consumed.

This has been somewhat stressed, not because it is needed by a Catholic congregation, but because even in our loving eyes the sanctity of Mary is more truly realized when we ponder on its cause than when we attempt to gaze on it in itself. Our dear Redeemer is not only the *whole reason* for all that is Mary, but by His most Precious Blood He is the *whole cause* of the abundant redemption of His most dear Mother, and of all her holiness, from the first grace of her Immaculate Conception till He crowned His work in her resplendent soul in glory. She is the Woman clothed with the Sun, and crowned with stars, and so abiding for ever, for the changeable moon is beneath her feet.

(4) These notes would be very incomplete on this subject of the Incarnation if in the course of them the attention of our people were not drawn to the appropriation of this mystery to that Person of the Ever Blessed Trinity, who is always designated by the word *Holy*—the Holy Spirit: and this section on the holiness of Our Blessed Lady seems a fitting context. He it is Who is set before us in the creeds as operating the whole of this mystery. The Son of God is conceived by the Holy Ghost, incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. Notice also, in the account of the Annunciation, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee . . ." Further, not only is the third Person of the Blessed Trinity revealed to us as *Holy*, but as Sanctifier. Of so many who were drawn into early contact with this mystery do we read that they "were filled with the Holy Ghost". Of holy Simeon we read that the Holy Ghost was in him, that he had received an answer from the Holy Ghost, and that led by the Spirit he came into the Temple. The Holy Spirit is very prominent in the whole history of Zachary, Elizabeth, and John the Baptist. Zachary was filled with the Holy Ghost; and to him the Angel Gabriel had foretold that his son would be "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb". In the most gracious mystery of the Visitation, Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, and the infant John leaped in her womb for very joy at the gift of holiness and faith, and at his vocation, which revealed to him the presence of his yet unborn Saviour! And the instrument of the Holy Ghost in all that work of sanctification was the sound of Mary's voice! "And it came to pass, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost." What an insight have we not here into the holiness of Mary's soul!

W. BERNARD DYER, O.S.C.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

THE PROPER AT SUNG MASS

If the choir is unable to sing the Proper, even on a monotone, may it be omitted altogether or sung by the celebrant himself? (X.Y.Z.)

REPLY

Caereemoniale Episcop. I, xxviii, 6: Sed advertendum erit, ut, quando-
cunque per organum figuratur aliquid cantari, seu responderi alternatim
versiculis Hymnorum, aut Canticorum, ab aliquo de choro intelligibili voce
pronuntietur id, quod ob sonitum organi non cantatur. Et laudabile
esset, ut aliquis cantor coniunctim cum organo voce clara idem cantaret.
Cf. also *Motu Proprio*, 22 November, 1903, III, 8.

S.R.C., 22 May, 1894, n. 3827, II: Ea, quae cantorum schola exequi
alternatim debet, nunquam esse omittenda; sed vel per integrum cantanda,
vel si vocibus iungantur Organa partim concinenda, partim sub Organis
clara voce legenda, prout Caereemoniale Episcoporum praescribit; Symbolo
excepto, quod per integrum, si recurat, semper canendum erit.

Ibid., 8 August, 1906, n. 4189, I: Quando organa pulsantur, si prae-
dicta, nempe *Graduale*, *Offertorium* et *Communio* non cantentur, recitanda
sunt voce alta et intelligibili, iuxta mentem Caereemonialis Episcoporum
. . . n. 2994 . . . n. 3108.

The directions of the above texts are not meant as the normal, still less
as the ideal, method of rendering the Proper at a sung Mass. The chant
may be executed (in more than one sense of the word) in this way, when-
ever it is not possible to sing it exactly as the *Graduale* prints it. Happily,
we think, the method of alternating chant and organ is not common in this
country; it is more usual for at least one singer to chant the text on a mono-
tone, a practice which has the full approval of the Holy See; moreover, the
text may be merely recited, audibly and intelligibly, instead of being sung
on a monotone. It must be observed, however, that the practice is tolerated
only when there is an organ playing, and that the *Credo* may never be
rendered in this way.

The reason for these very liberal provisions is the desire of the Church
for a sung Mass, if it is at all possible, since the chief difficulty is the Proper.
But there is no justification for pushing these concessions still further, and
permitting the celebrant himself to take the office of cantor at a sung Mass.
We can find only one writer who is prepared to sanction this practice,
provided the chant or recitation is not done at the altar but at the *sedilia*:
l' Ami du Clergé, 1928, p. 542; two years later, 1930, p. 112, a decided negative
was given by this journal to an exactly similar question, and without any
exception being made for the priest performing the office of cantor at the
sedilia. The rubrics for the sung Mass, except for the final blessing, direct
the priest to recite everything in a subdued voice. If the assistance of the
faithful is so meagre that not even one person can be found able to read

the Proper aloud, it seems to us quite certain that the priest must be content with Low Mass.

The replies quoted above mention only the Gradual, Offertory and Communion chants. From canon 20 the directions may be applied to the other parts of the Proper, and the commentators commonly explain them in this sense. Cf. O'Connell, *Celebration of Mass*, III, p. 50.

EN EGO

Is a plenary indulgence obtainable each time the prayer "En ego" is recited with the attached conditions, or is it obtainable only once a month after reciting it daily? (O. P.)

REPLY

Preces et Pia Opera (1938), n. 171: Fidelibus, supra relatam orationem coram Iesu Christi Crucifixi imagine pie recitantibus, conceditur: *Indulgentia decem annorum; Indulgentia plenaria*, si praeterea sacramentalem confessionem instituerint, caelestem Panem sumpserint et ad mentem Summi Pontificis oraverint (*S.C. Indulg.*, 31 July, 1858; *S. Penit.*, 2 February, 1934).

The indulgence may be gained each time the conditions are fulfilled, not merely once a month. The text in the current Missal mentions the plenary indulgence only; the partial indulgence was added in 1934 and is incorporated in the current *Preces et Pia Opera*. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1934, VIII, p. 67.

LEGITIMACY FROM PUTATIVE MARRIAGE

Is there a solidly probable opinion for the view that a marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic contracted in a registry office is a putative marriage, and consequently that the children are canonically legitimate? It is presumed that the non-Catholic party is in good faith. (Parochus.)

REPLY

Canon 1015, §4: *Matrimonium invalidum dicitur putativum, si in bona fide ab una saltem parte celebratum fuerit, donec utraque pars de eiusdem nullitate certa evadat.*

Canon 1114: *Legitimi sunt filii concepti aut nati ex matrimonio valido vel putativo, nisi parentibus ob solemnem professionem religiosam vel susceptum ordinem sacrum prohibitus tempore conceptionis fuerit usus matrimonii antea contracti.*

(i) One view is that the word "celebratum" in canon 1015 means a marriage contracted with the canonical form required by canons 1094 and 1098; it would follow necessarily, if this view is correct, that the marriage of a Catholic in a registry office, since 1908, when *Ne Temere* came in force, cannot be putative, and that the children cannot be canonically legitimate.

Cappello, *De Matrimonio* (1939), n. 48, 2, is often cited in favour of this view, but the opinion is considerably modified in a later part of the treatise, n. 746. The chief reason in favour of this interpretation is that in the pre-Code law the observance of the canonical form was certainly essential for a putative marriage, and from canon 6 it must be maintained that the Code has introduced no change. This solution is, we think, the more probable one. Cf. Payen, *De Matrimonio*, nn. 135, 174.

(ii) The second view is that the Code no longer requires for putative marriage the observance of the canonical form. This is taught by Wernz-Vidal, *Jus Canonicum*, V, §22, f.n. (14), and Chelodi, *Jus Matrimoniale*, §9, though neither goes very fully into the question. The best treatment we know of this point is by Payen, *De Matrimonio*, §135, and Case 19, §174. Wherever possible the safe view of (i) should be followed in practice; for example, a dispensation should be sought from irregularity (canon 984.1) if the issue of such marriages desires holy orders. But the view favouring legitimacy is solidly probable at the moment, and, in our circumstances in this country, this view should be maintained, in our opinion, in order not to cause unnecessary offence to non-Catholics: they already regard our marriage laws as unjust to the non-Catholic party of a mixed marriage, and there is no need to fix the stigma of canonical illegitimacy to the offspring of such marriages contracted in registry offices, until it becomes quite certain, by some official decision, that this is actually the case.

LOCAL LAW AND HOUSES OF REGULARS

May it be held today, at least as a probable opinion, that a priest who is staying within his diocese in a religious house of exempt regulars is not bound by the local diocesan laws, exactly in the same way that he is not bound by these laws when staying outside the diocese? (W.)

REPLY

Canon 13, §2: *Legibus conditis pro peculiari territorio ii subiiciuntur pro quibus latae sunt quique ibidem domicilium vel quasi-domicilium habent et simul actu commorantur, firmo praescripto can. 14.*

Canon 14, §1, 1: *Non adstringuntur legibus particularibus sui territorii quandiu ab eo absunt, nisi aut earum transgressio in proprio territorio noceat, aut leges sint personales.*

(i) We must exclude from this discussion all those laws made by the local Ordinary which exempt regulars are themselves bound to observe, for example, laws regulating divine worship (canon 1261, §2) or the mass stipend (canon 831, §3). Nor are we concerned here with episcopal ordinances which are indubitably personal and which bind the subject wherever he goes. It must be observed also that certain abbeys are not within any diocesan territory: they are *abbatiae nullius* and are in effect the equivalent of a small diocese, as provided for in canon 215, §2; it is certain

that whatever freedom from his own diocesan law is enjoyed by a priest outside of his diocese is enjoyed also in an *abbatia nullius*. The question to be defined is whether every house of exempt regulars is to be considered as not within the territory of the diocese for the purpose of determining the obligations of visiting diocesan priests.

(ii) In the Middle Ages it was very widely held that the monasteries of exempt religious were extra-territorial, but from the sixteenth century onwards the opinion became more and more accepted which regarded their exemption as personal rather than territorial. Onclin discusses the subject very fully in *De territoriali vel personali legis indole* (1938), pp. 119 seq. and 221 seq., and he shows that, notwithstanding the pre-Code opinion to the contrary, it must be held, under the Code discipline, that the houses of exempt religious are not extra-territorial, always excepting the *abbatia nullius*. This is a necessary conclusion from the many canons which uphold episcopal jurisdiction over these places exactly as in any other part of the diocese. Cf. canons 337, §1 (use of pontificals), 792 (administering confirmation), 1155, §1 (consecrations), 1343, §1 (preaching), 349, §2, 2, and Code Commission, 6 December, 1930 (indulgences). The list of modern commentators who agree with this interpretation is imposing, and includes such authorities as Van Hove, Cappello, and Vermeersch-Creusen.

Onclin, op. cit. p. 359, concludes: "Quibus ex dispositionibus (Codicis) apparet domus et ecclesias regularium esse in territorio et de territorio dioecesis, exemptionem domus regularium non esse plene localem, sed tantum quantum postulat ratio personalis exemptionis religiosorum." This doctrine is so unassailable that it is adopted by regular canonists, who are rightly inclined to interpret as widely as possible their privilege of exemption. Thus Beste, O.S.B., *Introductio*, p. 71: "Monasteria aliave loca exempta vi exemptionis non desinunt esse in territorio dioecesis in qua situm habent ac consequenter incolae et advenae dioecesis ibi versantes, si excipias personas quae personali exemptione fruuntur, non sunt absentes a territorio."

(iii) A few post-Code writers are quoted for the opposite opinion, namely, that visitors in a monastery are not bound by local diocesan law, but we know of none who substantiates this interpretation. Thus Génicot-Salsmans, *Theologia Moralis*, I, §114, is often cited, though he does no more than record that St. Alphonsus thought this view "probable"; this is historically correct, but no one can maintain that St. Alphonsus may be followed when he is expounding a law which, in our present discipline, has been modified. Noldin is also mentioned, *Theologia Moralis* (1936), I, §151, though he is content to record that in this controversy the opinion prevailing after the Code is that which we have described above under (ii). Coronata, *Institutiones*, I, §15, states that laity visiting monasteries are probably exempt from local episcopal laws. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome* (1937), I, §112, whilst defending the view given above under (ii), concedes external probability to the opposite view, relying on the teaching of Noldin and Coronata. Personally, before agreeing that this view is probable, we should like to know the reasons upon which it is based. Perhaps these are discussed in the series of articles in *Commentarium pro Religiosis*, VI, 1925, p. 82, which are mentioned by Onclin, Van Hove and others. The

writer, D. Ramos, decides for the common interpretation given in (ii), but we have not been able to consult this journal and cannot say whether he considers the opposite view to be "probable".

SUPPLIED JURISDICTION

Is some just cause absolutely necessary before one can invoke the title of supplied jurisdiction in canon 209? The solution given, *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1944, XXIV, p. 138 (iii), is too strict, since a just cause is not required by Cappello, Noldin and others. (P. H.)

REPLY

Canon 209: In errore communi aut in dubio positivo et probabili sive iuris sive facti, iurisdictionem supplet Ecclesia pro foro tum externo, tum interno.

(i) The canon provides a written law for what previously was largely a matter of custom or interpretation. There is no question of the *validity* of absolution given with supplied jurisdiction, within the terms of the canon; nor does the question of *lawfulness* arise when coming to a decision about an action already performed in good faith. But in deciding, before the event, whether one is entitled lawfully to give absolution with the supplied jurisdiction of canon 209, the point at issue is whether some just cause is or is not necessary. In the case of "common error" the writers are agreed that a just cause is required: Cappello, *De Poenitentia* (1938), §493; Noldin, *De Sacramentis* (1935), §347; *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1941, XXI, p. 237.

(ii) In the case of "positive and probable doubt" our own preference is for the necessity of some justifying cause, following St. Alphonsus, VI, §573; Wouters, I, §104; Marc-Gestermann, II, §1762. Others, as Tanquerey, I, §431, require a just cause "in dubio facti" but not "in dubio iuris". The reason for our preference, notwithstanding the fact that the Code makes no mention of the necessity of a just cause, is that the Church is not presumed to "supply" jurisdiction *ad licitatem* unless there is some reason for so doing. Accordingly, the solution given in *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1944, XXIV, p. 138 (iii), and, previously, 1943, XXIII, p. 138, was in line with this interpretation, which we believe to be the correct one.

(iii) But the opposite and more liberal view which requires, indeed, a just cause for invoking "common error", but not in cases of positive and probable doubt, is very widely held, though no very satisfactory reason is given for distinguishing between the two cases. Thus Cappello, §499; Noldin, §347; Tummolo-Iorio, II, §542. Their teaching may certainly be followed, and in so far as we failed to mention it in solving the two cases above mentioned, the solution may rightly be described as too strict. Gougard, *De Poenitentia* (1939), p. 268, and Prümmer, III, 414, whilst holding that no just cause is required, recommend that certain jurisdiction should be obtained from the ordinary channels as soon as possible. This teaching, which seems reasonable, will perhaps satisfy both schools of thought.

GILDING OF CIBORIUM

Is there a common law that the interior of the ciborium must be gilt?
(X.)

REPLY

Canon 1270: . . . in pyxide ex solida decentique materia (repeated in Roman Ritual, Tit. iv, cap. i, n. 5).

Caerem. Ep., II, xxx, n. 3: . . . in vase aureo vel argenteo, saltem intus deaurato.

S.R.C., 31 August, 1867, n. 3162, vi: An permitti possit Ciborium, seu sacra Pyxis, ex cupro deaurato? Affirmative.

The point for decision is not what is fitting and becoming in a vessel which is to contain the Holy Eucharist, nor are we asked to determine the kind of grave necessity which would permit the non-observance of the law. The question is whether, granted the lawfulness of silver or a metal baser than silver, which is not in dispute, there is an obligation to have this metal gilded within.

The texts quoted above are not, perhaps, absolutely conclusive. The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* directs "silver" gilded within, but silver is certainly not now of obligation in the common law; S.R.C., n. 3162, permits "copper" gilt without directing expressly that copper which is not gilded is forbidden.

Nevertheless, it is unmistakably implied in S.R.C., n. 3162, that copper is permissible provided it is gilded, and in our view, therefore, the minimum required by the common law is that the ciborium must be gilded within, no matter of what material it is made. The liturgical writers we have consulted, and the commentators on canon 1270, give this interpretation: O'Connell, *Celebration of Mass*, I, p. 252; J.P.R. in *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1939, XVII, p. 83; Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome* (1934), II, n. 595: "neque ex cupro, nisi sit intus deauratum"; *Directions for the Use of Altar Societies* (1933), p. 45; O'Kane, *Rubrics of the Roman Ritual* (1938), n. 578; *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1904, XXXI, p. 227.

On the other hand, Gasparri, *De Eucharistia*, n. 1005, after quoting S.R.C., n. 3162, states: "Imo propter verba generalia Ritualis Romani non bene constat de vero inaurationis praecepto pro ciborio, sicuti constat pro patena." One may, therefore, relying on Gasparri's authority, hold that there is no certain law requiring the ciborium to be gilded within, though the whole weight of opinion is to the contrary.

E. J. M.

(A question from "X.Y.Z." on November Masses has been answered in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1942, XXII, p. 81.)

PARISH PROBLEMS

WOMEN'S MEETINGS

A WEEKLY meeting for women in the afternoon about the middle of the week may be a tiresome hindrance to our freedom; yet it can serve a number of useful purposes which do not immediately appear. Such meetings, whether we describe them as guilds or confraternities, are especially desirable in parishes where the majority of the parishioners belong to much the same class, either to the working class or to that vast, indescribable body of worthy and long-suffering citizens who are neither lower nor upper nor yet quite middle. Among these are many admirable women whose daily life is inevitably a dull and unending round of household duties, and others—widows, elderly spinsters, and pensioners retired from some humble occupation—whose outlook is lonely and cheerless, being limited to one or two rooms and rarely extending beyond the walk to church or to the nearest shops. For many of these a weekly meeting which is sufficiently pious but more prominently social is an event: it is somewhere definite to go, an occasion of pleasant, if simple, entertainment and instruction, and an opportunity of making friends. In their own parlance it "makes a change".

But there are still wiser reasons for encouraging such meetings: they supply a need, and that need is being cunningly turned to their own account by various political and commercial organizations. Co-operative societies have their adult schools and women's guilds, and it often happens that at their meetings lectures are given by persuasive experts on subjects which are repulsive to Catholics. Those of our women who are attracted to these meetings will excuse their attendance at them on the plea that they must have somewhere to go and that nothing is provided by their church.

It is neither practical nor suitable for a priest to try to direct a women's guild alone and unaided; there should always be a woman president. Fortunately is the parish priest who has a convent where the rules are sufficiently elastic to allow one of the community to interest herself. An understanding nun can do wonderful work for women. They will treat her with peculiar reverence, quite different from the respect they give to anyone else, and they will likewise unburden themselves to her as to no other. The next best is one who passes as a lady in the social sense of the term. Women of the kind we have in mind are always gratified by the friendly attention and interest of a lady, and will gladly talk to her about their home affairs: perhaps they vaguely feel that she raises them to her level instead of coming down to theirs; perhaps also some simple souls even imagine that at last they are tasting samples of genuine democracy.

Apart from the initial difficulty of finding the right person to preside, the workings of weekly afternoon meetings are simple enough. The same set pattern, justified by experience, seems to be followed everywhere. They should begin with a short prayer, and if the number present is sufficient a hymn might be sung. A register of attendance should be kept; this is not a point of great importance, but it does undoubtedly keep up the interest. The greater part of the time should be devoted to reading, beginning with

a book of pious reflections or doctrinal instruction which should not take up more than ten minutes, and then passing on to something of fictional interest. The choice of suitable fiction is sometimes perplexing; it need not be if it is remembered that women, except those who have plenty of leisure, are not great readers and are not exacting in their literary preferences. Lengthy novels should be avoided. Simple, homely, short stories such as appear in popular magazines of feminine interest are by far the most suitable, and there are plenty to be found, steeped in Catholic atmosphere, in Catholic periodicals and amongst the excellent publications of the C.T.S. Occasionally, but not too often, it is a splendid thing to get a qualified person to give a lecture on some subject of special interest, and a discussion should follow. The members should be encouraged to bring their small children and their needlework.

It is not necessary for a priest to attend every meeting, but it does, indeed, help on the good work and give pleasure to all if he makes a point of putting in an appearance during that expansive interval when tea is being served.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

Francis Cardinal Bourne. By Ernest Oldmeadow, K.C.G. Vol. II. Pp. 421. (Burns Oates. 18s.)

MR. OLDMEADOW'S success in completing his important biography within a decade of the Cardinal's decease calls for congratulation, notwithstanding the opinion of some that a two-volume work, though traditional in recording the lives of the Archbishops of Westminster, was in this particular case rather more than was necessary or desirable. It is true that this second volume contains one or two short chapters, such as that on animal welfare, which might well have been omitted; it is true also that many readers may feel inclined to skip the description of the Cardinal's travels on pilgrimages and in the Near East, important though many of these journeys were. Unlike St. Paul, for whom missionary journeys were a duty, a modern diocesan bishop has a canonical obligation of residence, a duty which Cardinal Bourne never lightly disregarded; and consequently the chief interest of his life lies with his activities in this country. But two volumes are not too much to devote to the life of an Archbishop of Westminster, for the very position which he holds makes the story of his episcopate a chapter in the history of the Church in this land.

Indeed, we are inclined to lament that this second volume is not even fuller than it actually is, though there are doubtless excellent reasons for certain omissions. Mr. Oldmeadow gives us, for example, some extremely interesting information about the scheme for dividing dioceses which was introduced at the time of the creation of the new Provinces. Similar details about certain other schemes of nation-wide interest, if they could properly be published, would be equally welcome: for example, we should like to

know more about the "ill-fortune which dogged the negotiations" for establishing a Theological Faculty at the English Universities. When we remember that small countries like Holland or Switzerland have flourishing Catholic Universities it would seem that, by this time, there should be some beginnings of one in England.

Many will think it a pity that it has been necessary to relate the details of certain controversies that arose between the Cardinal, as head of the Catholic Church in this country, and other religious bodies; those who are of this opinion may hold, with great plausibility, that the present time, when "co-operation" between all religious bodies is being urged by the Holy See, is singularly inopportune for recording differences which had better be forgotten. Yet we all know, unhappily, that there is a point beyond which a policy of appeasement towards foreign countries becomes a menace to the safety of the State, and the same is true of the Church in its relations with non-Catholic bodies. None could be more averse than Cardinal Bourne, both by temperament and conviction, to engaging in disputes and controversies, and we may be quite certain that, when he did so, it was because it was not only his right but his duty to defend the truth, as he did very ably at York and at Buckfast in answering the claim of the Established Church to be the same body as the Catholic Church in pre-Reformation England.

Whenever he was able to join with non-Catholic bodies in common action for social purposes, he never failed to lend the weight of his name and authority, but his wise remarks on "joint action" in general are well worth pondering. "We are constantly being asked," he said, "to join in various Societies and make united appeals. Until, say, thirty years ago it was a good deal easier to say 'Yes'. Today one has to hesitate a good deal. Appeals are put forth, almost entirely based on sentiment, with no definite principle underlying them, and the Catholic who joins, especially if he occupies a position of prominence, never knows when he may be placed in a false position and be called upon to give adherence to statements which directly contradict Catholic principle." It would seem fairly simple for all Christian bodies to agree, for example, on a social programme for the preservation of the family. But when we reflect that Catholic principles on the subject are well-defined and those of non-Catholics vague, if not positively wrong, the difficulty and the danger of which the Cardinal speaks become apparent. Thus in the condemnation of contraceptive practices, which strike at the very foundations of the family, the Catholic Church in this country is ploughing a lonely furrow. The Cardinal was grieved, though he could hardly have been surprised, that the support given to Dr. Sutherland came almost exclusively from Catholics, and a few years later the Lambeth resolution made it plain that on this elementary point of natural law the Established Church declined to be guided by principle.

The concluding chapter on the Malines Conferences, which is the only complete account yet published from a Catholic point of view, might well be printed separately. The subject is highly controversial, and it does, unhappily, remind us again of events which many may think should be consigned to oblivion. But history has a way of repeating itself, and the possible objections to relating the whole truth about this series of rather mysterious "goings on" are more than outweighed by the permanent

benefit conferred thereby on our own and on future generations, which may at any time be placed in similar circumstances. When the time comes for further "conversations" the parties thereto will at least know what not to do; they will all surely agree that a matter so closely affecting the Church in England can best be handled by English Catholics on English soil.

In diebus suis placuit Deo et inventus est justus. Our appreciation of the Cardinal's stature and worth is deepened by reading this volume. We see in him neither a great scholar nor even a great ecclesiastical statesman, but a Prince of the Church who courageously defended its rights and those of the Holy See, a bishop guarding his flock and multiplying the clergy under his pastoral jurisdiction, a great priest who in his days pleased God and was found faithful.

E. J. M.

Officium et Missae Pro Defunctis. Pp. 176. (Gill & Sons, Dublin. 5s.)

THIS useful collection of liturgical texts with plainsong notation comprises the "Exequiarum Ordo" from the *Rituale Romanum*, Tit. vi, cap. iii-vii; the office of All Souls Day from the *Breviarium Romanum*; the six Requiem Masses from the *Missale Romanum* together with "Orationes Diversae pro Defunctis"; and the "Quinque Absolutiones" from the *Pontificale Romanum*.

The difficulty at present experienced in obtaining liturgical books from continental publishers has quickened the ambitions of our own publishers in these islands, and we hope that the experiment will be continued and perfected. The work is edited by Rev. John Lane, Dean of Maynooth.

Since we are given nothing beyond the text from the typical edition of the liturgical books above mentioned, the only thing a reviewer can do is to compare this home product with editions of similar books obtained from abroad. Except that the rubrics are printed in black italics throughout, the collection is a faithful reprint of the originals in the form to which we are accustomed, and the editor has not allowed, so far as we can discover, any printer's errors to escape his notice.

The only defect is in the musical notation, which lacks the neatness and clarity of the foreign editions: the notes are sometimes too crowded together, and occasionally the syllables of the words are not printed directly beneath the notes to which they are meant to correspond. Firms such as Pustet, which have been doing the work for years, have perfected the process of printing plainsong, which must be a very specialized and technical work; we do not doubt that eventually our own publishers will equal, if not surpass, the work of foreign printers. Apart from this point, we think that the printing and format are superior, on the whole, to the similar books obtainable from abroad: the print is large and easy to read; the paper is not the excessively thin rice paper favoured by liturgical printers, but stout and of good texture; and the size, 5 by 7½ inches, is very convenient for the pocket. It would be a good idea to include in future editions a few loose pages at the end, for receiving the vernacular *formulae* which we are accustomed to recite at funerals.

E. J. M.

Saints for Girls. By a Servite Nun. Pp. 208. (Sands & Co. 6s.)

THIS book contains twelve simple biographies, beginning with a life of Our Lady, and including well-established favourites such as St. Teresa of Lisieux, and some much less familiar figures as Queen Jadwiga of Poland and St. Lidwina. They are written simply and attractively, and are well suited to the needs of girls of school age. E. J. M.

Statuta Archidioecesis Madraspolitanae. Pp. xxii + 490. (The Good Pastor Press, Madras. Rs. 5.)

THE Code of Canon Law assumes throughout that each locality or diocese will have its own local legislation supplementing the common law where necessary. In England certain dioceses, such as Liverpool or Lancaster, are fortunate in having the statutes of some recent Synod easily obtainable in print; other dioceses have to rely on the clergy carefully retaining the individual instructions sent to them from the diocesan curia over a period of years. It is clearly an advantage to have the diocesan statutes, whether promulgated in Synod or not, printed together in one volume, as in the present instance, and its perusal is instructive for the clergy who have an interest in the more practical aspect of canon law, even though they are living far away from Madras and are not under the jurisdiction of its Ordinary.

For, in some particulars, the local law makes clear what is often doubtful in the common law, thus supplying an interpretation which, though not authoritative in other places, is a good and reliable guide. Thus 384 (4): "Parochus vero infantis adnotationem collati baptismi, memoriae causa, in suo libro baptismali inscribat, cum adnotatione loci ubi baptismus administratus fuerit." In the Archdiocese of Madras, at least, when baptism is administered in a parish other than that of domicile, the record is to be entered in the baptismal register of the latter as well as in that of the former; this is, we believe, the correct interpretation of the common law. In n. 519 the Ordinary prohibits, except during missions, the rite of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament more than once a day in the same church, a rule which correctly interprets the spirit, though not the letter, of the common law. Facial "make-up" is forbidden in the case of women candidates for Confirmation (n. 397).

From these examples it will be seen that the Statutes are abreast of modern needs, and, as the Holy See expects will be done, they make quite explicit for local use the general directions of the Church. Thus, as we all know, the "Missa dialogata", to be lawful, requires the Ordinary's sanction: this is given in n. 430: "Mos, quo fideles respondent sacerdoti celebranti una cum ministro, commendabilis est et pietati fovendae utilis, dummodo id ordinatum ac devote fiat."

In addition to the Statutes, the volume contains the text of a number of recent Roman decrees, the rules of various pious associations in the diocese, and the order to be followed at functions such as the installation of a parish priest. In spite of an unusually large number of misprints, the book is of outstanding value and interest, a good example of how local diocesan law should be codified, and a pattern for other dioceses to imitate.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

A CATHOLIC COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

The following letter has been received from the Editorial Committee of the above undertaking:

Some of your readers might be interested to know that there is now in course of compilation, under the auspices of the Catholic Biblical Association, a one-volume *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, the purpose of which is to sum up in a handy and practical form the accepted results of Catholic biblical scholarship, and to put them at the disposal, not only of priests and clerical students, but of Catholic teachers and educated laymen. It will include a number of introductory articles in addition to commentaries on every book in the Bible, and will run to about one and a half million words. It will therefore fill a large and obvious gap in English Catholic scriptural literature. The undertaking, which has the full approval of the Archbishop of Westminster, will require the collaboration of a large number of contributors (the services of most of whom have already been secured) and will take two or three years to complete.

There is one practical way in which the Clergy might be of great assistance to the Editorial Committee, and that is by the gift, loan or sale of copies of *foreign* books on Old or New Testament. Copies of Catholic treatises, commentaries, periodicals (including incomplete series), etc., dealing with any aspect of Old or New Testament, and published between 1920-40 in France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy or Spain, including any volumes in the "Bonn Bible" Series, the *Verbum Salutis* Series, the *Etudes Bibliques* Series, any other publications of the Dominican School at Jerusalem, or any publications of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, would be gratefully accepted, purchased or borrowed. Since these books can no longer be obtained through the ordinary channels the intention is to establish a central reference library for the benefit of our contributors. Any such books which your readers may have lying idle on their shelves would be of great immediate use if sent with a note stating the conditions on which they would be prepared to part with them to DOM BERNARD ORCHARD, Downside Abbey, near Bath.

Finally, the Editorial Committee would be most grateful if all who are interested would assist them by their prayers that this work, which is likely to be widely diffused, may be worthily done.

Signed:

DOM BERNARD ORCHARD (General Editor and N.T. Editor).

E. F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J. (O.T. Editor).

R. FULLER (Secretary, The Catholic Biblical Association).

DOM RALPH RUSSELL (Hon. Secretary and Treasurer).

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

of the

there is
Biblical
the pur-
accepted
disposal,
and edu-
addition
out one
gap in
has the
labora-
m have

at assis-
sale of
Catholic
, etc.,
between
cluding
ies, the
school at
ould be
can no
o estab-
ny such
ld be of
a which
CHARD,

who are
which is

litor).

).

For
pe
Lo
pat
on